## Preface

The requirements for the assessment of real property for the purposes of property taxation are found in Nebraska law. The Constitution of Nebraska requires that "taxes shall be levied by valuation uniformly and proportionately upon all real property and franchises as defined by the Legislature except as otherwise provided in or permitted by this Constitution." Neb. Const. art. VIII, sec. 1 (1) (1998). The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as "the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade." Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (R.R.S., 2003). The assessment level for all real property, except agricultural land and horticultural land, is one hundred percent of actual value. The assessment level for agricultural land and horticultural land, hereinafter referred to as agricultural land, is seventy-five percent of actual value. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201(1) and (2)(R.S. Supp., 2007). More importantly, for purposes of equalization, similar properties must be assessed at the same proportion of actual value when compared to each other. Achieving the constitutional requirement of proportionality ultimately ensures the balance equity in the imposition of the property tax by local units of government on each parcel of real property.

The assessment process, implemented under the authority of the county assessor, seeks to value similarly classed properties at the same proportion to actual value. This is not a precise mathematical process, but instead depends on the judgment of the county assessor, based on his or her analysis of relevant factors that affect the actual value of real property. Nebraska law provides ranges of acceptable levels of value that must be met to achieve the uniform and proportionate valuation of classes and subclasses of real property in each county. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023 (R.S. Supp., 2007) requires that all classes of real property, except agricultural land, be assessed within the range of ninety-two and one hundred percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land be assessed within the range of sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of actual value; the class of agricultural land receiving special valuation be assessed within the range sixty-nine to seventy-five percent of its special value; and, when the land is disqualified for special value the recapture value be assessed at actual value.

To ensure that the classes of real property are assessed at these required levels of actual value, the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division, hereinafter referred to as the Division, is annually responsible for analyzing and measuring the assessment performance of each county. This responsibility includes requiring the Property Tax Administrator to prepare statistical and narrative reports for the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, and the county assessors. Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R.S. Supp., 2005):
(2) ... the Property Tax Administrator shall prepare and deliver to the commission and to each county assessor his or her annual reports and opinions.
(3) The annual reports and opinions of the Property Tax Administrator shall contain statistical and narrative reports informing the commission of the level of value and the quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property within the county and a certification of the opinion of the Property Tax

Administrator regarding the level of value and quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property in the county.
(4) In addition to an opinion of level of value and quality of assessment in the county, the Property Tax Administrator may make nonbinding recommendations for consideration by the commission.

The narrative and statistical reports contained in the Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator, hereinafter referred to as the R\&O, provide a thorough, concise analysis of the assessment process implemented by each county assessor to reach the levels of value and quality of assessment required by Nebraska law. The Property Tax Administrator's opinion of level of value and quality of assessment achieved by each county assessor is a conclusion based upon all the data provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Division regarding the assessment activities during the preceding year. This is done in recognition of the fact that the measurement of assessment compliance, in terms of the concepts of actual value and uniformity and proportionality mandated by Nebraska law, requires both statistical and narrative analysis.

The Division is required by Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327 (R. S. Supp., 2007) to develop and maintain a state-wide sales file of all arm's length transactions. From this sales file the Division prepares an assessment sales ratio study in compliance with acceptable mass appraisal standards. The assessment sales ratio study is the primary mass appraisal performance evaluation tool. From the sales file, the Division prepares statistical analysis from a non-randomly selected set of observations, known as sales, from which inferences about the population, known as a class or subclass of real property, may be drawn. The statistical reports contained in the R\&O are developed in compliance with standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers, hereinafter referred to as the IAAO.

However, just as the valuation of property is sometimes more art than science, a narrative analysis of assessment practices in each county is necessary to give proper context to the statistical inferences from the assessment sales ratio study. There may be instances when the analysis of assessment practices outweighs or limits the reliability of the statistical inferences of central tendency or quality measures. This may require an opinion of the level of value that is not identical to the result of the statistical calculation. The Property Tax Administrator's goal is to provide statistical and narrative analysis of the assessment level and practices to the Commission, providing the Commission with the most complete picture possible of the true level of value and quality of assessment in each county.

The Property Tax Administrator's opinions of level of value and quality of assessment are stated as a single numeric representation for level of value and a simple judgment regarding the quality of assessment practices. Based on the information collected in developing this report the Property Tax Administrator may feel further recommendations must be stated for a county to assist the Commission in determining the level of value and quality of assessment within a county. These opinions are made only after considering all narrative and statistical analysis provided by the county assessor and gathered by the Division. An evaluation of these opinions must only be made after considering all other information provided in the R\&O.

Finally, after reviewing all of the information available to the Property Tax Administrator regarding the level and quality of assessment for classes and subclasses of real property in each county, the Property Tax Administrator, pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027(4) (R.S. Supp., 2005), may make recommendations for adjustments to value for classes and subclasses of property. All of the factors relating to the Property Tax Administrator's determination of level of value and quality of assessment shall be taken into account in the making of such recommendations. Such recommendations are not binding on the Commission.
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## 2008 Commission Summary

## Residential Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 709 |  | COD |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 95,260,373$ | PRD | 9.87 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 95,260,373$ | COV | 103.50 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 87,947,750$ | STD | 18.37 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 134,359$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 17.56 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 124,045$ | Min | 9.27 |
| Median | 93.88 | Max | 51.70 |
| Wgt. Mean | 92.32 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 9305.45 |
| Mean | 95.55 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 91.30 to 94.51 |
|  |  | $95 \%$ Mean C.I. | 94.26 to 96.85 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 50.91 |
| :--- | ---: |
| of Records Sold in the Study Period | 9.4 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 10.03 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 116,309 |


| Residential Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 709 | 93.88 | 9.87 | 103.50 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 801 | 95.71 | 12.37 | 103.81 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 774 | 94.36 | 11.66 | 102.37 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 667 | 94.93 | 10.99 | 101.83 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 593 | 94.10 | 12.20 | 103.03 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 589 | 95 | 10.16 | 101.14 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 671 | 94 | 8.64 | 100.44 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 761 | 98 | 7.81 | 101.07 |

## 2008 Commission Summary

## Commercial Real Property - Current

| Number of Sales | 43 | COD | 20.36 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: |
| Total Sales Price | $\$ 8,537,400$ | PRD | 99.08 |
| Total Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 8,537,400$ | COV | 27.35 |
| Total Assessed Value | $\$ 8,132,365$ | STD | 25.81 |
| Avg. Adj. Sales Price | $\$ 198,544$ | Avg. Abs. Dev. | 19.36 |
| Avg. Assessed Value | $\$ 189,125$ | Min | 21.55 |
| Median | 95.08 | Max | 149.73 |
| Wgt. Mean | 95.26 | $95 \%$ Median C.I. | 83.81 to 103.89 |
| Mean | 94.38 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I. | 84.87 to 105.64 |
|  |  | $95 \%$ Mean C.I. | 86.67 to 102.10 |


| \% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County | 15.31 |
| :--- | ---: |
| \% of Records Sold in the Study Period | 5.96 |
| \% of Value Sold in the Study Period | 3.08 |
| Average Assessed Value of the Base | 365,235 |


| Commercial Real Property - History |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Year | Number of Sales | Median | COD | PRD |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 43 | 95.08 | 20.36 | 99.08 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 48 | 101.20 | 16.49 | 100.92 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 50 | 97.69 | 19.29 | 104.58 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 40 | 98.36 | 15.22 | 108.75 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 40 | 94.25 | 20.94 | 106.19 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 39 | 95 | 19.58 | 103.11 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 44 | 98 | 13.55 | 100.95 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 45 | 97 | 12.45 | 106.52 |

Opinions

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Washington County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me about the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While I rely primarily on the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property, my opinion of level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained in the RO. Although my primary resource regarding quality of assessment are the performance standards issued by the IAAO, my opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

## Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Washington County is $94 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Washington County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Washington County is $95 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Washington County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
709
$95,260,373$
$95,260,373$
$87,039,480$
134,358
122,763

| 94 | COV: | 19.25 | $95 \%$ Median C.I.: | 93.48 to 95.05 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 91 | STD: | 18.23 | 95\% Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 90.26 to 92.48 |
| 95 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 10.90 | $95 \%$ Mean C.I.: | 93.33 to 96.0 |

Printed: 02/09/2008 13:11:58

| DATE OF SALE * |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 | 115 |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 90 |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 88 |
| 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 | 97 |
| 07/01/06 TO 09/30/06 | 113 |
| 10/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 69 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 60 |
| 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 | 77 |
| Study Years |  |
| 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06 | 390 |
| 07/01/06 TO 06/30/07 | 319 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |
| 01/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 367 |
|  |  |


| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 94.08 | 94.93 | 91.56 |
| 95.44 | 94.47 | 93.09 |
| 95.72 | 96.53 | 92.69 |
| 94.29 | 94.26 | 92.20 |
| 93.59 | 96.86 | 91.94 |
| 94.31 | 93.33 | 89.12 |
| 91.94 | 91.94 | 89.88 |
| 93.03 | 93.03 | 89.28 |
| 94.63 | 95.02 | 92.29 |
| 93.57 | 94.25 | 90.23 |
| 94.35 | 95.43 | 91.62 |
| 94.31 | 94.67 | 91.37 |


| COD | PRD |
| ---: | ---: |
|  |  |
| 13.59 | 103.68 |
| 11.16 | 101.49 |
| 11.58 | 104.14 |
| 8.23 | 102.24 |
| 13.16 | 105.35 |
| 12.43 | 104.72 |
| 10.61 | 102.30 |
| 10.57 | 104.20 |
| 11.29 | 102.96 |
| 11.90 | 104.45 |
| 11.37 | 104.16 |
| 11.56 | 103.61 |


| MIN | MA |
| ---: | ---: |
| 51.70 | 192.5 |
| 55.24 | 139.6 |
| 63.44 | 173.97 |
| 67.98 | 147.0 |
| 53.47 | 305.4 |
| 56.16 | 167.20 |
| 52.76 | 140.6 |
| 63.06 | 125.7 |
| 51.70 | 192.5 |
| 52.76 | 305.4 |
| 53.47 | 305.45 |
| 51.70 | 305.4 |

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{cc}\text { Avg. Adj. } \\
\text { Sale Price }\end{array}
$$ \begin{array}{c}Avg. <br>

Assd Val\end{array}\right]\)|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 143,725 | 131,597 |
| 118,886 | 110,667 |
| 134,301 | 124,486 |
| 141,564 | 130,516 |
| 123,595 | 113,637 |
| 144,660 | 128,918 |
| 131,250 | 117,962 |
| 138,428 | 123,591 |
|  |  |
| 135,329 | 124,894 |
| 133,172 | 120,159 |
| 134,872 | 123,573 |
|  |  |
| 134,358 | 122,763 |

# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics <br> ype: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

State Stat Run



## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008



709
$95,260,373$
$95,260,373$
$87,039,480$
134,358
122,763

| 94 | COV: | 19.25 | 95\% Median C.I.: | 93.48 to 95.05 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 91 | STD: | 18.23 | $95 \%$ Wgt. Mean C.I.: | 90.26 to 92.48 |
| 95 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 10.90 | $95 \%$ Mean C.I.: | 93.33 to 96.01 |


| ASSESSED VALUE * RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 4999 | 5 | 105.00 | 141.30 | 105.85 | 47.50 | 133.49 | 72.73 | 305.45 | N/A | 2,340 | 2,477 |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 18 | 89.46 | 105.80 | 89.19 | 41.29 | 118.63 | 51.70 | 261.25 | 70.45 to 107.60 | 6,914 | 6,166 |
| Total \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 23 | 93.57 | 113.52 | 90.62 | 44.26 | 125.27 | 51.70 | 305.45 | 72.73 to 107.60 | 5,919 | 5,364 |
| 10000 тO | 29999 | 45 | 99.00 | 97.32 | 94.09 | 15.34 | 103.43 | 52.41 | 150.00 | 92.49 to 102.04 | 25,077 | 23,596 |
| 30000 то | 59999 | 81 | 97.33 | 99.95 | 96.55 | 12.21 | 103.52 | 58.75 | 173.97 | 94.08 to 100.00 | 48,155 | 46,496 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 168 | 93.95 | 93.32 | 90.90 | 11.96 | 102.67 | 52.76 | 134.95 | 91.46 to 95.71 | 89,305 | 81,177 |
| 100000 TO | 149999 | 183 | 92.44 | 92.95 | 91.54 | 9.58 | 101.54 | 55.24 | 147.05 | 91.00 to 94.75 | 133,095 | 121,840 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 159 | 94.63 | 93.49 | 92.56 | 7.09 | 101.00 | 68.77 | 128.66 | 93.58 to 95.72 | 202,458 | 187,397 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 48 | 93.22 | 89.35 | 87.60 | 10.29 | 102.00 | 59.35 | 106.24 | 85.52 to 97.64 | 355,539 | 311,456 |
| $\begin{gathered} 500000+ \\ \text { ALL } \end{gathered}$ |  | 2 | 96.43 | 96.43 | 95.19 | 4.12 | 101.30 | 92.46 | 100.40 | N/A | 739,216 | 703,695 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 709 | 94.31 | 94.67 | 91.37 | 11.56 | 103.61 | 51.70 | 305.45 | 93.48 to 95.05 | 134,358 | 122,763 |
| QUALITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 201 | 96.39 | 98.85 | 92.53 | 16.28 | 106.83 | 51.70 | 305.45 | 94.39 to 98.07 | 61,551 | 56,954 |
| 10 |  | 3 | 107.50 | 104.34 | 101.05 | 2.95 | 103.25 | 98.00 | 107.51 | N/A | 61,300 | 61,945 |
| 15 |  | 1 | 109.39 | 109.39 | 109.39 |  |  | 109.39 | 109.39 | N/A | 38,000 | 41,570 |
| 20 |  | 26 | 91.16 | 96.64 | 95.04 | 15.44 | 101.69 | 62.63 | 144.52 | 86.98 to 100.01 | 78,948 | 75,033 |
| 25 |  | 59 | 92.29 | 94.58 | 92.42 | 11.10 | 102.34 | 75.66 | 134.95 | 88.26 to 98.60 | 106,224 | 98,174 |
| 30 |  | 229 | 92.75 | 92.13 | 90.64 | 10.15 | 101.65 | 55.24 | 147.05 | 91.42 to 94.06 | 134,777 | 122,156 |
| 35 |  | 94 | 94.88 | 93.57 | 92.98 | 5.99 | 100.63 | 70.95 | 105.88 | 93.58 to 96.97 | 182,574 | 169,753 |
| 40 |  | 81 | 93.88 | 91.78 | 89.40 | 8.85 | 102.66 | 64.40 | 113.65 | 91.77 to 96.12 | 255,454 | 228,375 |
| 45 |  | 9 | 99.16 | 92.87 | 90.23 | 8.40 | 102.93 | 65.51 | 105.63 | 81.73 to 100.40 | 362,084 | 326,700 |
| 50 |  | 5 | 96.53 | 95.43 | 94.28 | 5.96 | 101.22 | 83.41 | 104.69 | N/A | 378,995 | 357,313 |
| 55 ALI |  | 1 | 97.95 | 97.95 | 97.95 |  |  | 97.95 | 97.95 | N/A | 475,000 | 465,270 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 709 | 94.31 | 94.67 | 91.37 | 11.56 | 103.61 | 51.70 | 305.45 | 93.48 to 95.05 | 134,358 | 122,763 |



# Washington County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/ subclasses: 

## Residential

Completed the realist (and re-appraise) of the residential properties in the city of Blair (the land may be at market but the improvements may need to be what will be adjusted). And a preliminary analysis completed by the county indicates and acceptable level of value has been achieved. Small towns and rural subdivisions were reviewed with minor adjustments needed in only a few market areas. Pickup work was also completed for the current year.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Washington County

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Appraisal staff |
|  | Appraisal staff |$|$| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Appraisal staff |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are <br> used to value this property class? |
|  | 2005 |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was <br> developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2005 |
| 6. | What was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was <br> used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | N/A |
| 7. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class: |
|  | 455 Urban: 200, Suburban: 20, Rural: 235 |


| 11. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> $\mathbf{0 0 1 . 0 7 B} \boldsymbol{?}$ <br> limits of an incorpan shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | No The suburban parcels are treated and appraised the same as the rural parcels. |
| 12. | Are the county's ag residential and rural residential improvements classified <br> and valued in the same manner? <br> Yes |
|  |  |

## Residential Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 700 |  |  | 700 |

89 - WASHINGTON COUNTY RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

## State Stat Run

| 709 | MEDIAN: |
| ---: | ---: |
| $95,260,373$ | WGT. MEAN: |
| $95,260,373$ | MEAN : |
| $87,947,750$ |  |
| 134,358 | COD: |
| 124,044 | PRD : |


| 94 | COV: | 18.37 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 92 | STD | 17.56 |
| 96 | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 9.27 |

95\% Median C.I.: 93.20 to 94.51
NUMBER of Sales: TOTAL Sales Price TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: AL Assessed Value: AVG. Adj. Sales Price

124, 044
PRD: $\quad 103.50$
MIN Sales Ratio: 51.70

| DATE OF SALE * |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT |
| Qrtrs |  |
| 07/01/05 TO 09/30/05 | 115 |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 90 |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 | 88 |
| 04/01/06 то 06/30/06 | 97 |
| 07/01/06 то 09/30/06 | 113 |
| 10/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 69 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 60 |
| 04/01/07 то 06/30/07 | 77 |
| Study Years |  |
| 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06 | 390 |
| 07/01/06 TO 06/30/07 | 319 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |
| 01/01/06 TO 12/31/06 | 367 |
|  |  |


| MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
| 94.15 | 95.95 | 92.29 |
| 95.67 | 95.38 | 93.73 |
| 94.86 | 96.92 | 93.80 |
| 93.70 | 95.78 | 93.98 |
| 92.93 | 97.27 | 92.67 |
| 93.08 | 94.16 | 90.34 |
| 92.26 | 92.12 | 90.22 |
| 94.65 | 94.71 | 90.13 |
|  |  |  |
| 94.75 | 96.00 | 93.36 |
| 93.10 | 95.01 | 91.03 |
| 93.68 | 96.21 | 92.83 |
| 93.88 | 95.55 | 92.32 |

COD
11.97
9.63
11.05
6.27
11.71
9.73
8.33
8.05
9.83
9.83
9.78
9.87
PRD
103.9
101.76
103.32
101.92
104.97
104.2
102
105.081
102.82
104.37
103.

| MIN | MA |
| ---: | ---: |
| 51.70 | 192.56 |
| 56.52 | 139. |
| 66.05 | 184. |
| 74.64 | 147. |
| 53.47 | 305. |
| 56.16 | 167. |
| 60.77 | 158. |
| 65.91 | 139. |
| 51.70 | 192. |
| 53.47 | 305. |
| 53.47 | 305. |
| 51.70 | 305. |


| MAX | $95 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2.56 | 92 |

Avg. Adj. Avg.


# PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics 


TO
TVI
STATUS: IMPROVED AVG. Assessed Value

| STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED \& IOLL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 1 | 516 | 93.36 | 93.73 | 91.95 | 7.40 | 101.94 | 56.52 | 160.84 | 92.80 to 93.95 | 162,945 | 149,832 |
| 2 | 191 | 96.39 | 100.57 | 95.28 | 15.74 | 105.55 | 51.70 | 305.45 | 95.32 to 97.97 | 57,694 | 54,973 |
| 3 | 2 | 86.05 | 86.05 | 83.35 | 16.23 | 103.23 | 72.08 | 100.01 | N/A | 80,500 | 67,100 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 709 | 93.88 | 95.55 | 92.32 | 9.87 | 103.50 | 51.70 | 305.45 | 93.20 to 94.51 | 134,358 | 124,044 |
| PROPERTY TYPE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| 01 | 707 | 93.88 | 95.58 | 92.34 | 9.86 | 103.51 | 51.70 | 305.45 | 93.20 to 94.51 | 134,511 | 124,205 |
| 06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07 | 2 | 86.05 | 86.05 | 83.35 | 16.23 | 103.23 | 72.08 | 100.01 | N/A | 80,500 | 67,100 |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 709 | 93.88 | 95.55 | 92.32 | 9.87 | 103.50 | 51.70 | 305.45 | 93.20 to 94.51 | 134,358 | 124,044 |
| SCHOOL DISTRICT * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11-0001 | 24 | 93.08 | 95.27 | 93.50 | 11.31 | 101.90 | 71.62 | 147.05 | 86.78 to 98.38 | 93,464 | 87,388 |
| 27-0594 | 5 | 102.39 | 110.43 | 106.78 | 15.09 | 103.42 | 86.36 | 158.04 | N/A | 129,000 | 137,752 |
| 28-0059 | 11 | 95.94 | 96.83 | 84.50 | 15.54 | 114.59 | 66.05 | 139.22 | 74.86 to 117.26 | 185,613 | 156,852 |
| 89-0001 | 501 | 94.06 | 96.03 | 93.37 | 8.37 | 102.85 | 51.70 | 261.25 | 93.60 to 94.65 | 135,239 | 126,271 |
| 89-0003 | 93 | 92.07 | 91.95 | 88.40 | 12.38 | 104.01 | 52.41 | 144.52 | 87.84 to 94.63 | 153,701 | 135,876 |
| 89-0024 | 75 | 93.58 | 95.73 | 91.02 | 14.60 | 105.18 | 56.16 | 305.45 | 90.29 to 98.00 | 110,419 | 100,501 |
| NonValid School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 709 | 93.88 | 95.55 | 92.32 | 9.87 | 103.50 | 51.70 | 305.45 | 93.20 to 94.51 | 134,358 | 124,044 |

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008
NUMBER of Sales:
TOTAL Sales Price:
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:
TOTAL Assessed Value:
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:
709
$95,260,373$
$95,260,373$
$87,947,750$
134,358
124,044




## Residential Real Property

## I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: As with last year the appraisal actions for the assessment of this property class are apparent, through the pro-active approach with the appraisal and office staff that many of the goals that were set have been achieved. These results are the product of the continued efforts for better equalization and uniformity within this class of property. The median is most representative of the overall level of value for this class of property.

Another analysis that is being initiated is where if one can identify a small subclass of property in the sales file where the coefficient of dispersion measurement is very low. It is assumed a small number of sales could not be so predictable as to be appraised and then measured and produce a low coefficient of dispersion. And could be suspect to either sales chasing or excessive trimming of outlying sales. In the residential class of property in Washington County it appears that there are two subclasses identified in the assessor location category that indicate low coefficient of dispersion's. They are Cottonwoods V (vacant), Crystal Lake V and maybe Heidi Hollow West V. It should be noted that all three of these examples are new and developing subdivisions where the sale prices are closely controlled by the developer. And thus an appraisal (assessed) value can be fairly predictable. In these instances I see no issues that would indicate either sales chasing or excessive trimming.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 956 | 709 | 74.16 |
| 2007 | 1093 | 801 | 73.28 |
| 2006 | 1105 | 774 | 70.05 |
| 2005 | 961 | 667 | 69.41 |
| 2004 | 861 | 593 | 68.87 |
| 2003 | 765 | 589 | 76.99 |
| 2002 | 800 | 671 | 83.88 |
| 2001 | 914 | 761 | 83.26 |

RESIDENTIAL: The sales qualification and utilization for this property class is the sole responsibility of the county assessor. The above table indicates that a reasonable percentage of all available sales is being utilized for the sales study, and would indicate that the county is not excessively trimming the residential sales file.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Washington County

## III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& O$ median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.
[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063=0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio Continued

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 94.31 | 1.72 | 95.93 |  |
| 2007 | 92.52 | 3.45 | 95.71 | 93.81 |
| 2006 | 91.36 | 5.32 | 96.22 | 94.36 |
| 2005 | 93.55 | -1.06 | 92.55 | 94.93 |
| 2004 | 93.48 | 2.86 | 96.16 | 94.10 |
| 2003 | 92 | 4.62 | 96.25 | 95 |
| 2002 | 94 | -0.4 | 93.62 | 94 |
| 2001 | 97 | 0.99 | 97.96 | 98 |

RESIDENTIAL: This comparison between the trended level of value and the median level of value for this class of property indicates that the two rates are somewhat similar and tend to support each other.

## IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.89 | 2008 | 1.72 |
| 4.43 | 2007 | 3.53 |
| 4.58 | 2006 | 5.32 |
| 1.54 | 2005 | -1.06 |
| -0.17 | 2004 | 2.86 |
| 3 | 2003 | 5 |
| 2.54 | 2002 | -0.4 |
| 1.01 | 2001 | 0.99 |

RESIDENTIAL: There is a less than a one point spread in the percent change for this property class, indicating a difference between the two units of measurement. This is not a significant difference and is not out of line.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for "direct" equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for "indirect" equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 3 . 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{9 2 . 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 . 5 5}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The measures of central tendency shown here reflect that the statistics for the qualified sales for this property type are within the acceptable range. There is a slight difference between the three measures of central tendency with the mean being slightly above the others. This comparison provides a fairly reasonable indication this property type is being treated uniformly and proportionately. The median is the best indication of level of value for this county for this property type.

## VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.
The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | $\mathbf{9 . 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 3 . 5 0}$ |
| Difference | 0 | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ |

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion on the qualified sales is within the acceptable range. The price-related differential is just outside the range. But this still indicates a general level of good assessment uniformity for this property class as a whole.

## VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R\&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 709 | 709 | 0 |
| Median | 94.31 | 93.88 | -0.43 |
| Wgt. Mean | 91.37 | 92.32 | 0.95 |
| Mean | 94.67 | 95.55 | 0.88 |
| COD | 11.56 | 9.87 | -1.69 |
| PRD | 103.61 | 103.50 | -0.11 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 51.70 | 51.70 | 0 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 305.45 | 305.45 | 0 |

RESIDENTIAL: The statistics for this class of property in this county represent the assessment actions completed for this property class for this assessment year.

# PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics 



## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

## Type: Qualified



## Type: Qualified <br> Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008




## PAD 2008 Preliminary Statistics

Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


# Washington County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/ subclasses: 

## Commercial

In the area of the commercial the land zoned and classified as commercial has been re-appraised and new commercial land values were implemented last year. For this year the commercial properties were reviewed and minor changes were implemented. Pickup work was also completed for the current year.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Washington County

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Contract Appraiser |
| 2. | Valuation done by: |
|  | Contract Appraiser |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Contract Appraiser |
| 4. | What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class? |
|  | 2001 |
| 5. | What was the last year the depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information? |
|  | 2003 |
| 6. | When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | 2002 |
| 7. | When was the last year that the Market or Sales Comparison Approach was used to estimate the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | N/A |
| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods for this property class? |
|  | 3 Two Commercial and One Industrial |
| 9. | How are these defined? |
|  | The commercial market areas are defined by the downtown zoned area of Blair and then all other commercially zoned areas. The industrial area is defined by zoning. |
| 10. | Is "Assessor Location" a usable valuation identity? |
|  | No |
| 11. | Does the assessor location "suburban" mean something other than rural commercial? (that is, does the "suburban" location have its own market?) |
|  | N/A The suburban parcels are treated and appraised the same as the rural parcels. |


| 12. | What is the market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10- <br> $\mathbf{0 0 1 . 0 7 B}$ ? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the <br> limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an <br> incorporated city or village.) |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | None |

Commercial Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Included in the Res |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Date Rang | e: 07/ | 01/2004 to 06/30/2 | 007 Posted | fore: 01/1 | 2008 |  |  | (!: AVTot=0) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER of | f Sales: |  | 43 | MEDIAN: | 95 |  | COV: | 27.35 |  | edian | C.I.: 83.81 | to 103.89 | (!: Derived) |
| total Sales | Price: |  | 8,537,400 | WGT. MEAN: | 95 |  | STD: | 25.81 | 95\% Wg | Mean | C.I.: 84.87 | to 105.64 |  |
| total Adj.Sales | Price: |  | 8,537,400 | MEAN : | 94 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 19.36 |  | Mean | C.I.: 86.6 | to 102.10 |  |
| TOTAL Assessed | d Value: |  | 8,132,365 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Adj. Sales | Price: |  | 198,544 | COD : | 20.36 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 149.73 |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG. Assessed | d Value: |  | 189,124 | PRD : | 99.08 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 21.55 |  |  |  | Printed: 03/31/ | 8 20:06:53 |
| DATE OF SALE * <br> RANGE | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Avg. Adj. <br> Sale Price | Avg. <br> Assd Val |
| Qrtrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 то 09/30/04 | 3 | 103.89 | 98.75 | 118.08 | 19.95 |  | 83.63 | 65.08 | 127.27 |  | N/A | 302,500 | 357,193 |
| 10/01/04 то 12/31/04 | 5 | 103.58 | 108.09 | 101.30 | 14.84 |  | 106.70 | 79.08 | 149.73 |  | N/A | 56,300 | 57,033 |
| 01/01/05 то 03/31/05 | 4 | 108.99 | 101.72 | 97.48 | 14.91 |  | 104.34 | 63.88 | 125.00 |  | N/A | 52,875 | 51,543 |
| 04/01/05 то 06/30/05 | 2 | 93.04 | 93.04 | 96.51 | 27.07 |  | 96.40 | 67.85 | 118.22 |  | N/A | 145,000 | 139,940 |
| 07/01/05 то 09/30/05 | 9 | 87.95 | 89.40 | 86.75 | 13.01 |  | 103.06 | 73.86 | 106.20 | 74.49 | 9 to 104.89 | 365,111 | 316,738 |
| 10/01/05 то 12/31/05 | 3 | 94.02 | 92.61 | 87.98 | 8.15 |  | 105.26 | 80.41 | 103.39 |  | N/A | 78,133 | 68,740 |
| 01/01/06 то 03/31/06 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04/01/06 TO 06/30/06 | 2 | 106.83 | 106.83 | 112.27 | 6.91 |  | 95.15 | 99.44 | 114.21 |  | N/A | 532,500 | 597,815 |
| 07/01/06 то 09/30/06 | 3 | 78.91 | 67.24 | 61.75 | 33.67 |  | 108.89 | 21.55 | 101.25 |  | N/A | 233,333 | 144,083 |
| 10/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 4 | 129.73 | 113.76 | 124.01 | 24.03 |  | 91.73 | 48.29 | 147.30 |  | N/A | 193,500 | 239,966 |
| 01/01/07 то 03/31/07 | 3 | 95.01 | 80.35 | 84.67 | 15.48 |  | 94.90 | 50.96 | 95.08 |  | N/A | 99,166 | 83,963 |
| 04/01/07 то 06/30/07 | 5 | 92.99 | 86.97 | 80.22 | 11.54 |  | 108.42 | 66.05 | 103.61 |  | N/A | 98,000 | 78,613 |
| ___Study Years_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07/01/04 то 06/30/05 | 14 | 105.47 | 102.12 | 109.01 | 17.68 |  | 93.68 | 63.88 | 149.73 | 67.85 | 5 to 125.00 | 120,750 | 131,628 |
| 07/01/05 то 06/30/06 | 14 | 94.20 | 92.58 | 92.74 | 11.95 |  | 99.83 | 73.86 | 114.21 | 74.70 | 0 to 104.89 | 327,528 | 303,749 |
| 07/01/06 то 06/30/07 | 15 | 94.15 | 88.84 | 90.08 | 25.84 |  | 98.63 | 21.55 | 147.30 | 66.05 | 5 to 103.61 | 150,766 | 135,804 |
| Calendar Yrs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01/01/05 TO 12/31/05 | 18 | 94.20 | 93.08 | 88.09 | 16.13 |  | 105.66 | 63.88 | 125.00 | 74.70 | 0 to 106.20 | 223,438 | 196,828 |
| 01/01/06 то 12/31/06 | 9 | 101.25 | 96.71 | 101.92 | 29.93 |  | 94.89 | 21.55 | 147.30 | 48.29 | 9 to 142.57 | 282,111 | 287,527 |
|  | 43 | 95.08 | 94.38 | 95.26 | 20.36 |  | 99.08 | 21.55 | 149.73 | 83.81 | 1 to 103.89 | 198,544 | 189,124 |
| ASSESSOR LOCATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE Cound | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| ARLINGTON | 4 | 104.14 | 95.78 | 93.42 | 11.66 |  | 102.52 | 63.88 | 110.94 |  | N/A | 43,000 | 40,172 |
| ARLINGTON V | 2 | 113.13 | 113.13 | 104.79 | 10.50 |  | 107.96 | 101.25 | 125.00 |  | N/A | 23,500 | 24,625 |
| BLAIR | 21 | 99.44 | 100.67 | 99.15 | 19.43 |  | 101.53 | 65.08 | 149.73 | 79.08 | 8 to 107.04 | 218,019 | 216,162 |
| BLAIR V | 5 | 94.15 | 79.36 | 66.52 | 21.61 |  | 119.30 | 21.55 | 107.12 |  | N/A | 163,700 | 108,894 |
| FT CALHOUN | 3 | 87.95 | 87.58 | 87.42 | 5.29 |  | 100.18 | 80.41 | 94.38 |  | N/A | 398,333 | 348,231 |
| HERMAN | 1 | 74.49 | 74.49 | 74.49 |  |  |  | 74.49 | 74.49 |  | N/A | 45,000 | 33,520 |
| KENNARD | 2 | 102.26 | 102.26 | 102.68 | 1.30 |  | 99.59 | 100.93 | 103.58 |  | N/A | 30,250 | 31,060 |
| RURAL | 3 | 114.21 | 99.05 | 108.99 | 14.84 |  | 90.88 | 66.05 | 116.89 |  | N/A | 501,666 | 546,773 |
| RURAL V | 2 | 49.63 | 49.63 | 49.91 | 2.69 |  | 99.44 | 48.29 | 50.96 |  | N/A | 58,000 | 28,945 |
| -ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 43 | 95.08 | 94.38 | 95.26 | 20.36 |  | 99.08 | 21.55 | 149.73 | 83.81 | 1 to 103.89 | 198,544 | 189,124 |

# PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics <br> Type: Qualified 



PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008

## State Stat Run



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | /2004 to 06/30 | 7 | ore: 01/18 | 008 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBE | f Sale |  | 43 | MEDIAN: | $95$ |  | COV: | 27.35 | 95\% | dian | C.I.: 83.8 | to 103.89 | (!: Derived) |
|  | TOTAL S | s Pric |  | , 400 | WGT. MEAN: | 95 |  | STD: | 25.81 | 95\% Wg | Mean | C.I.: 84.8 | to 105.64 |  |
|  | L Adj. ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | s Pric |  | , 400 | MEAN : | 94 |  | AVG.ABS.DEV: | 19.36 |  | Mean | C.I.: 86. | to 102.10 |  |
|  | AL Asse | d Valu |  | , 365 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVG | Adj. S | s Pric |  | , 544 | COD : | 20.36 | MAX | Sales Ratio: | 149.73 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | G. Asse | d Valu |  | , 124 | PRD : | 99.08 | MIN | Sales Ratio: | 21.55 |  |  |  | Printed: 03/31/ | 8 20:06:53 |
| ASSESSED VA <br> RANGE | UE * |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. Sale Price | Avg. Assd Val |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| __Low \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5000 TO | 9999 | 1 | 125.00 | 125.00 | 125.00 |  |  |  | 125.00 | 125.00 |  | N/A | 7,000 | 8,750 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 TO | 9999 | 1 | 125.00 | 125.00 | 125.00 |  |  |  | 125.00 | 125.00 |  | N/A | 7,000 | 8,750 |
| 10000 TO | 29999 | 4 | 102.91 | 90.31 | 78.90 | 15.25 |  | 114.46 | 48.29 | 107.12 |  | N/A | 25,375 | 20,021 |
| 30000 TO | 59999 | 13 | 94.38 | 88.96 | 70.88 | 21.51 |  | 125.50 | 21.55 | 147.30 | 63.88 | 8 to 103.61 | 61,684 | 43,725 |
| 60000 TO | 99999 | 9 | 92.99 | 93.40 | 87.49 | 21.26 |  | 106.75 | 65.08 | 149.73 | 67.85 | 5 to 110.94 | 94,888 | 83,020 |
| 100000 то | 149999 | 7 | 80.41 | 85.84 | 84.36 | 14.36 |  | 101.76 | 66.05 | 106.20 | 66.05 | 5 to 106.20 | 142,857 | 120,508 |
| 150000 TO | 249999 | 1 | 118.22 | 118.22 | 118.22 |  |  |  | 118.22 | 118.22 |  | N/A | 165,000 | 195,070 |
| 250000 TO | 499999 | 4 | 110.62 | 110.68 | 108.44 | 17.22 |  | 102.06 | 78.91 | 142.57 |  | N/A | 345,750 | 374,931 |
| $500000+$ |  | 4 | 101.08 | 103.31 | 99.16 | 17.24 |  | 104.18 | 83.81 | 127.27 |  | N/A | 1,056,250 | 1,047,392 |
| _ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 43 | 95.08 | 94.38 | 95.26 | 20.36 |  | 99.08 | 21.55 | 149.73 | 83.81 | 1 to 103.89 | 198,544 | 189,124 |
| COST RANK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Avg. Adj. | Avg. |
| RANGE |  | COUNT | MEDIAN | MEAN | WGT. MEAN | COD |  | PRD | MIN | MAX | 95\% M | Median C.I. | Sale Price | Assd Val |
| (blank) |  | 9 | 94.15 | 80.26 | 66.39 | 26.99 |  | 120.89 | 21.55 | 125.00 | 48.29 | 9 to 107.12 | 109,055 | 72,401 |
| 10 |  | 11 | 95.01 | 100.56 | 92.07 | 20.12 |  | 109.22 | 65.08 | 149.73 | 67.85 | 5 to 147.30 | 84,263 | 77,581 |
| 15 |  | 4 | 92.65 | 94.50 | 98.00 | 18.41 |  | 96.43 | 74.49 | 118.22 |  | N/A | 89,750 | 87,956 |
| 20 |  | 18 | 100.19 | 97.09 | 99.92 | 16.97 |  | 97.17 | 63.88 | 142.57 | 78.04 | 4 to 110.94 | 334,722 | 334,438 |
| 25 |  | 1 | 104.34 | 104.34 | 104.34 |  |  |  | 104.34 | 104.34 |  | N/A | 245,000 | 255,645 |
| $\ldots$ ALL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 43 | 95.08 | 94.38 | 95.26 | 20.36 |  | 99.08 | 21.55 | 149.73 | 83.81 | 1 to 103.89 | 198,544 | 189,124 |

89 - WASHINGTON COUNTY COMMERCIAL

PAD 2008 R\&O Statistics
Type: Qualified
Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


## Commerical Real Property

## I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The median is most representative of the overall level of value for this class of property. The assessments of this property class are apparent, through the pro-active approach with the appraisal and office staff that many of the goals that were set have been achieved.

## II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

|  | Total Sales | Qualified Sales | Percent Used |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 95 | 43 | 45.26 |
| 2007 | 85 | 48 | 56.47 |
| 2006 | 86 | 50 | 58.14 |
| 2005 | 80 | 40 | 50 |
| 2004 | 83 | 40 | 48.19 |
| 2003 | 85 | 39 | 45.88 |
| 2002 | 100 | 44 | 44 |
| 2001 | 118 | 46 | 38.98 |

COMMERCIAL: The sales qualification and utilization for this property class is a combined effort between the County and the Department. The above table indicates that a reasonable percentage of all available sales are being utilized for the sales file study period for this property type.

## 2008 Correlation Section <br> for Washington County

## III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and $\mathrm{R} \& O$ median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the $\mathrm{R} \& \mathrm{O}$ median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

## Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels ("sales chasing") is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.
[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063=0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.
III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R\&O Median Ratio Continued

|  | Preliminary <br> Median | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) | Trended Preliminary <br> Ratio | R\&O Median |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2008 | 93.47 | 2.67 | $\mathbf{9 5 . 9 6}$ |  |
| 2007 | 90.16 | 3.22 | 93.06 | $\mathbf{9 5 . 0 8}$ |
| 2006 | 97.69 | 0.05 | 97.74 | 97.20 |
| 2005 | 93.08 | -0.04 | 93.05 | 98.36 |
| 2004 | 86.90 | 1.77 | $\mathbf{8 8 . 4 4}$ | 94.25 |
| 2003 | 94 | 0.23 | 94.22 | 95 |
| 2002 | 95 | 5.98 | 100.68 | 98 |
| 2001 | 96 | 7.47 | 103.17 | 97 |

COMMERCIAL: This comparison between the trended level of value and the median level of value for this class of property indicates that the two rates are very similar and tend to support each other.

## IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2008 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2008 R\&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

## Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 311.
IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued

| \% Change in Total <br> Assessed Value in the Sales | \% Change in Assessed <br> Value (excl. growth) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3.84 | 2008 | 2.67 |
| 2.57 | 2007 | 3.65 |
| 0 | 2006 | 0.05 |
| 17.54 | 2005 | $\mathbf{- 0 . 0 4}$ |
| 20.04 | 2004 | 1.77 |
| 2 | 2003 | 0 |
| 1.47 | 2002 | 5.98 |
| 0.29 | 2001 | 7.47 |

COMMERCIAL: There is just over a one point spread in the percent change for this property class, indicating a difference between the two units of measurement. This is not a significant difference and is not out of line.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for "direct" equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for "indirect" equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

## V. Analysis of the R\&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

|  | Median | Wgt. Mean | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 95.08 | 95.26 | 94.38 |

COMMERCIAL: With this information the median is the most reliable measure of the level of value for this class of property. The measures of central tendency illustrate the weighted mean and mean are within the acceptable range.

## VI. Analysis of R\&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller "spread" or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.
The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

|  | COD | PRD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| R\&O Statistics | 20.36 | 99.08 |
| Difference | 0.36 | 0 |

COMMERCIAL: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential are within the acceptable range as qualitative measures, and indicate a general level of good assessment uniformity for this property class as a whole.

## VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R\&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

|  | Preliminary Statistics | R\&O Statistics | Change |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Sales | 45 | 43 | -2 |
| Median | 93.47 | 95.08 | 1.61 |
| Sgt. Mean | 93.11 | 95.26 | 2.15 |
| Mean | 90.93 | 94.38 | 3.45 |
| COD | 18.21 | 20.36 | 2.15 |
| PRD | 97.67 | 99.08 | 1.41 |
| Min Sales Ratio | 37.06 | 21.55 | -15.51 |
| Max Sales Ratio | 149.03 | 149.73 | 0.7 |

COMMERCIAL: The above statistical reports support the actions of the assessor for this class of property for this assessment year.

# Washington County 2008 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/ subclasses: 

## Agricultural

Special Value - Based on preliminary analysis provided to the county by the Property Assessment Division indicated the level of value for Special Value to be below the acceptable range. This analysis indicated a need for the county to increase the values by 16 percent. The adjustments were meant to bring everything closer to the middle of the range.

A market analysis of sales from the adjoining market area in Burt County was also used as the basis for establishing the special values used to value the agricultural land in Washington County.

Recapture Value - Based on sales (the market) in the market areas, the analysis indicated a need to increase from the previous year's values in certain market areas. Some market areas indicated minimal or no change (the northwest part of the county) but the analysis is still showing and increase in the southern part of the county (area adjoining Douglas County). This analysis indicated a need to increase the values overall by 13 percent.

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Washington County

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

| 1. | Data collection done by: |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Appraisal staff |
|  | Appraisal staff by: |
| 3. | Pickup work done by whom: |
|  | Appraisal staff |
| 4. | Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically <br> define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages? |
|  | No Not at this time the county is working on this definition at this time to adapt to <br> current directives. |
| a. | How is agricultural land defined in this county? |
|  | The county is working on this definition at this time to adapt to current directives. |
| 5. | When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or <br> establish the market value of the properties in this class? |
|  | This approach to agricultural land values is not used. |
| 6. | What is the date of the soil survey currently used? |
|  | 1964 |
| 7. | What date was the last countywide land use study completed? |
|  | 2000 |
| a. | By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.) |
|  | Physical inspection |
| b. | By whom? |
|  | Appraisal staff |
| c. | What proportion is complete / implemented at this time? |
|  | Complete at this time. Anytime an owner requests a change the changes have to be <br> supported by FSA documentation. Land use does not rapidly change in this county. |
|  | Apr\| |
|  |  |


| 8. | Number of market areas/neighborhoods in the agricultural property class: |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | l6 Recapture values are maintained in 16 market areas. Special value is maintained <br> across the whole county or one market area. |
| 9. | How are market areas/neighborhoods defined in this property class? |
|  | Market influences by location identify the market area lines which are implemented <br> around transportation corridors and urban areas. Many of the market areas are <br> graduate transition areas which help transition market values across the whole <br> county. |
| 10. | Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special <br> valuation for agricultural land within the county? |
|  | Yes |

## Agricultural Permit Numbers:

| Permits | Information Statements | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Included in the Res |  |  |  |

## 2008 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Counties that have Implemented Special Value for Washington County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me about the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While I rely primarily on the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property, my opinion of level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained in the RO. Although my primary resource regarding quality of assessment are the performance standards issued by the IAAO, my opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

## Agricultural Land

## Not Applicable

## Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in Washington County is $72 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the special valuation of the class of agricultural land in Washington County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

## Recapture Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in Washington County is $72 \%$ of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the recapture valuation of the class of agricultural land in Washington County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.


# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION For <br> Washington County 

## Section I: Agricultural Land Correlation:

This correlation section does not apply to Washington County as Washington County is $100 \%$ special value, and is measured by the 994 analysis.

# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION For Washington County 

## II. Special Value Correlation

The measurement methodology was developed by the Department utilizing information from counties where only agricultural influence was recognized. I have reviewed the rents and rent to value ratios used to develop the preliminary measurements of Washington County with the assessor. The county accepted the results. But the assessor offered his opinion that the sales used to develop the data that was used for this analysis may have also been influenced by nonagricultural interests, causing even these sales to be unreliable for determining the non influenced values in other counties.

Based upon a review of the preliminary statistics, the county adjusted all three subclasses of unimproved agricultural land which caused the majority of this subclass of unimproved agricultural land to move within the acceptable range. It should be noted that the irrigated land in this subclass consists of only 5 percent (but the level of value is within the range) but the grass land part of this subclass representing 8 percent of the acres in this class moved slightly above the range at 76 percent. I do not feel that the subclass of either irrigated or grass land carry the weight that the dryland acres does and that the irrigated and grass acres do not represent a significant number of acres or sales or value to merit the need to adjust this subclass. There is not enough representation in these subclasses to call a strong level of value.

The level of value for the Special Value class of agricultural land is at 72 percent.
Refer to the following statistical analysis:


|  | COUNTY REPORT OF THE 2008 SPECIAL VALUATION PROCESS |  |  |  | WASHINGTON |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2007 ABSTRACT DATA |  | 2008 ABSTRACT DATA |  | Rates Used |
| MAJOR AGLAND USE | 2007 \% of ALL CLASSIFIED AGLAND | 2007 ABSTRACT ACRES | $\begin{gathered} 2008 \\ \text { \% of ALL } \\ \text { CLASSIFIED } \\ \text { AGLAND } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008 \\ \text { ABSTRACT } \\ \text { ACRES } \end{gathered}$ | ESTIMATED CORRELATED RATE (for each major land use) |
| Irrigated | 5.14\% | 10,935 | N/A | N/A | IRRIGATED RATE |
| Dryland | 79.87\% | 169,919 | N/A | N/A | 6.80\% |
| Grassland | 7.71\% | 16,412 | N/A | N/A | dryland rate |
| Waste | 6.97\% | 14,839 | N/A | N/A | 4.90\% |
| Other | 0.00\% | 5 | N/A | N/A | GRASS RATE |
| All Agland | 99.70\% | 212,109 | N/A | N/A | 3.20\% |
| Non-Agland | 0.30\% | 646 |  |  |  |

PRELIMINARY LEVEL OF VALUE BASED ON THE 2007 ABSTRACT

| Estimated Rent | $2007 \begin{gathered}\text { Assessed } \\ \text { Value }\end{gathered}$ | USE | Estimated Value | Average Rent per Acre | Preliminary Indicated Level of Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,817,696 | 16,518,115 | IRRIGATED | 26,730,818 | 166.23 | 61.79\% |
| 17,807,401 | 230,216,701 | DRYLAND | 363,416,354 | 104.80 | 63.35\% |
| 494,688 | 9,910,972 | GRASSLAND | 15,459,003 | 30.14 | 64.11\% |
| 20,119,785 | 256,645,788 | AII IRR-DRY-GRASS | 405,606,176 | 101.99 | 63.27\% |

ESTIMATED LEVEL OF VALUE BASED ON THE 2008 ABSTRACT

| Estimated Rent | 2008 Assessed | USE | Estimated Value | Average Rent per Acre | 2008 Indicated Level of Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N/A | N/A | IRRIGATED | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | DRYLAND | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | GRASSLAND | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| N/A | N/A | All IRR-DRY-GRASS | N/A | N/A | N/A |

CHANGES BY AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE FOR EACH MAJOR USE

| Average Value Per Acre of IRRIGATED Agricultural Land - Special Valuation |  |  |  | Average Value Per Acre of DRY Agricultural Land - Special <br> Valuation |  |  |  | Average Value Per Acre of GRASS Agricultural Land Special Valuation |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | @ | \$ | 1,5 | 2007 | @ | \$ | 1,3 | 2007 | @ | \$ |  | 603.90 |
| 2008 | @ |  | N/A | 2008 | @ |  | N/A | 2008 | @ |  | N/A |  |
| Percent change | = |  | N/A | Percent change | = |  | N/A | percent change | = |  | N/A |  |

[^0]
# SPECIAL VALUE SECTION <br> CORRELATION For Washington County 

## Section III: Recapture Value Correlation:

The statistics support the action taken by the assessor for this assessment year. This is a realistic portrayal of how the recapture (market) values are keeping up with the market values for the class as a whole and represents the actions taken by the assessor towards better equalization and assessment uniformity. The qualified Agricultural Unimproved report containing 47 sales with a Median of 72 percent is within the acceptable range for the level of value. The price related deferential and the coefficient of dispersion is outside the targeted level. Keeping in mind the non homogeneous nature of the whole agricultural land sales file would indicate that the county has in the past worked towards the improvement of the assessment of the agricultural land in the county and does not indicate unacceptable assessment practices. The assessor's office has been compelled to monitor the actions of the market values due to the high activity or interest in the purchase of tracts of agricultural land and then being developed for other uses such as for rural residential.

Refer to the following statistical analysis:

Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


Date Range: 07/01/2004 to 06/30/2007 Posted Before: 01/18/2008


February 15, 2008

Ruth Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator
Property Assessment Division
1033 "O" Street, Suite 600
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
RE: Special Valuation Methodology

Dear Ms. Sorensen \& the Division,

As per your request of February 15, 2008, and pursuant to REG -11-005.04 - this document contains the methodology Washington County used to determine the special and actual valuation of land receiving special valuation.

The Property Assessment Division provided Washington County with a County Report of the Special Valuation Process. This report is based on 2007 values and indicates preliminary level of value by use for 2008. The Washington County preliminary numbers are as follows:

| Irrigated - | $61.79 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Dry - | $63.35 \%$ |
| Grass - | $64.11 \%$ |
| Overall - | $63.27 \%$ |

It is my understanding that these preliminary 2008 special value numbers must be adjusted up to result in an acceptable range of $69 \%$ to $75 \%$ or else the Division will recommend and the Tax Equalization Review Commission will likely require an adjustment into the acceptable range. For this reason, all 2007 preliminary special values by use have been increased by approximately thirteen ( $13 \%$ ) percent for the 2008 tax year. As a result of the change, Washington County's special valuations for 2008 are similar or equal to surrounding counties.

Title 350, Chapter 11, Rev. 01/03/07
The assessor shall maintain a file of all data used for determining the special and actual valuation. This information shall be filed with the Department on or before March 1 each year. ..... This file shall include, but not limited to:
005.04A A determination of the highest and best use of the properties to be valued:

The value of almost all rural properties in Eastern Nebraska has been influenced by anticipation of future development. For this reason, the highest and best use for neighboring counties to the north of Washington County would be agricultural with anticipation of development being a slight factor. Burt County was used for 2008 as a comparison for Washington County's special value.

Market valuation by area concept will continue to be used to accurately reflect differences in value due to general location in the county. This concept is used in Washington County for the seventy five percent and one hundred percent of market (sales file) valuations in 2008. The established market areas and maps have not changed for 2008. Market areas in the Southern part of the county have been highly influenced by development potential. While market areas in the Northern part of the county have been valued closer to agricultural with some anticipation of future development.

### 005.04B An explanation of the valuation models used in arriving at the value estimates;

A new valuation model was not calculated for 2008. The Assessor believes that the cash rents are currently too volatile.

In the past, the correlation factor from capitalization of income from dry land cash rents in Burt County was applied to the cash rents in Washington County. The cash rents used for both Washington County (\$95.00) and Burt County ( $\$ 95.00$ ) were provided in the BELF maps provided by the Department of PA\&T.
005.04C A delineation and explanation of "market areas" recognized in the analysis;

Market areas in Burt County were used as the comparable to Washington County.
005.04D An explanation and analysis including documentation of adjustments made to sales to reflect current cash equivalency of typical market conditions;

The Burt County adjustments were included in the file.
005.04E An explanation and analysis of the estimate of economic rent or net operating income used in an income capitalization approach including estimates of yields, commodity prices, typical crop share, or documentation of cash rents.

BELF cash rents from a prior year were used.
005.04F An explanation and analysis of typical expenses allowed in an income capitalization approach;

Expenses from Burt to Washington were considered to be equal.
005.04G An explanation and analysis of the overall capitalization rate used in an income capitalization approach; and,

The capitalization rate is the multiplier used with the established income to arrive at the value of the land.
005.04H Any other information necessary in supporting the estimate of valuations.

Contact the Assessor if more is required.

Sincerely,

Steven Mencke<br>Washington County Assessor<br>1555 Colfax Street<br>Blair, Nebraska 68008

## County 89 - Washington
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## County 89 - Washington
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## County 89 - Washington

Schedule II:Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

Records \begin{tabular}{l}
Urban <br>
Value Base

$\quad$

Value Excess
\end{tabular}

|  | Total |  | Growth |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23. Mineral Interest-Producing | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 24. Mineral Interest-Non-Producing | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 25. Mineral Interest Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |


| Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban Records | SubUrban Records | Rural Records | Total Records |
| 26. Exempt | 313 | 21 | 256 | 590 |



County 89 - Washington
Schedule VI: Agricultural Records: Non-Agricultural Detail

| Non-Agricultural Detail | Records | Acres | Value | Records | Acres | Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 125 | 127.000 | 4,747,675 |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 0 |  | 0 | 130 |  | 17,525,835 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 143 | 139.720 | 247,025 |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 130 | 214.430 | 1,238,325 |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 0 |  | 0 | 130 |  | 2,333,110 |

38. FarmSite Total

| 39. Road \& Ditches | 0.000 |  |  | 219.340 |  |  | Growth Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 0.000 | 0 |  | 0.000 | 0 |  |
|  | Records | Rural Acres | Value | Records | Total Acres | Value |  |
| 31. HomeSite UnImp Land | 4 | 4.000 | 136,000 | 4 | 4.000 | 136,000 |  |
| 32. HomeSite Improv Land | 1,269 | 1,293.000 | 46,877,900 | 1,394 | 1,420.000 | 51,625,575 |  |
| 33. HomeSite Improvements | 1,292 |  | 167,747,765 | 1,422 |  | 185,273,600 | 5,352,291 |
| 34. HomeSite Total |  |  |  | 1,426 | 1,424.000 | 237,035,175 |  |
| 35. FarmSite UnImp Land | 667 | 663.710 | 973,625 | 810 | 803.430 | 1,220,650 |  |
| 36. FarmSite Impr Land | 1,367 | 3,113.300 | 15,668,390 | 1,497 | 3,327.730 | 16,906,715 |  |
| 37. FarmSite Improv | 1,408 |  | 29,226,560 | 1,538 |  | 31,559,670 | 0 |
| 38. FarmSite Total |  |  |  | 2,348 | 4,131.160 | 49,687,035 |  |
| 39. Road \& Ditches |  | 3,471.650 |  |  | 3,690.990 |  |  |
| 40. Other-Non Ag Use |  | 7.830 | 2,865 |  | 7.830 | 2,865 |  |
| 41. Total Section VI |  |  |  | 3,774 | 9,253.980 | 286,725,075 | 5,352,291 |


| Schedule VII: Agricultural Records: <br> Ag Land Detail-Game \& Parks | Records |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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## County 89 - Washington <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 323.380 | 784,195 | 323.380 | 784,195 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 268.600 | 635,250 | 268.600 | 635,250 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 31.000 | 60,295 | 475.640 | 925,120 | 506.640 | 985,415 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 246.000 | 418,200 | 246.000 | 418,200 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 730.340 | 1,066,300 | 730.340 | 1,066,300 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 52.320 | 62,260 | 52.320 | 62,260 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 940 | 184.000 | 172,960 | 185.000 | 173,900 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 38.000 | 32,300 | 38.000 | 32,300 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 32.000 | 61,235 | 2,318.280 | 4,096,585 | 2,350.280 | 4,157,820 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 121.370 | 260,940 | 3,637.490 | 7,821,540 | 3,758.860 | 8,082,480 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 105.140 | 222,370 | 11,221.310 | 23,734,850 | 11,326.450 | 23,957,220 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 232.450 | 461,420 | 13,113.000 | 26,032,435 | 13,345.450 | 26,493,855 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 225.520 | 358,580 | 2,719.100 | 4,330,490 | 2,944.620 | 4,689,070 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 79.670 | 105,165 | 7,134.660 | 9,433,050 | 7,214.330 | 9,538,215 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 75.240 | 97,435 | 5,233.250 | 6,797,325 | 5,308.490 | 6,894,760 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 233.500 | 232,340 | 13,204.010 | 13,152,820 | 13,437.510 | 13,385,160 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 29.000 | 21,170 | 1,647.850 | 1,202,940 | 1,676.850 | 1,224,110 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,101.890 | 1,759,420 | 57,910.670 | 92,505,450 | 59,012.560 | 94,264,870 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 153.360 | 162,565 | 153.360 | 162,565 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 17.000 | 15,980 | 1,082.050 | 1,017,130 | 1,099.050 | 1,033,110 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 16.000 | 13,760 | 268.480 | 230,900 | 284.480 | 244,660 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 22.000 | 17,050 | 799.500 | 629,415 | 821.500 | 646,465 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 3,450 | 860.030 | 603,815 | 865.030 | 607,265 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 3,570 | 366.370 | 218,000 | 372.370 | 221,570 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 35.000 | 19,775 | 826.470 | 466,960 | 861.470 | 486,735 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 17.000 | 8,670 | 190.000 | 96,900 | 207.000 | 105,570 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 118.000 | 82,255 | 4,546.260 | 3,425,685 | 4,664.260 | 3,507,940 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 234.600 | 41,115 | 1,656.000 | 334,955 | 1,890.600 | 376,070 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 9.150 |  | 9.150 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,486.490 | 1,944,025 | 66,431.210 | 100,362,675 | 67,917.700 | 102,306,700 |



| County 89 - Washington 20 |  | County 89 - Washington 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: 3 |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubU Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 22.400 | 54,320 | 273.500 | 663,240 | 295.900 | 717,560 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 99.250 | 234,730 | 634.220 | 1,499,935 | 733.470 | 1,734,665 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 241.710 | 470,130 | 922.700 | 1,794,660 | 1,164.410 | 2,264,790 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 3,400 | 15.000 | 25,500 | 17.000 | 28,900 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 42.500 | 56,590 | 2,793.020 | 3,436,250 | 2,835.520 | 3,492,840 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 3.270 | 3,890 | 45.000 | 53,550 | 48.270 | 57,440 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.500 | 67,210 | 71.500 | 67,210 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 411.130 | 823,060 | 4,754.940 | 7,540,345 | 5,166.070 | 8,363,405 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 24.660 | 53,020 | 631.770 | 1,358,310 | 656.430 | 1,411,330 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 112.420 | 237,770 | 1,717.020 | 3,631,495 | 1,829.440 | 3,869,265 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 200.500 | 397,995 | 1,510.400 | 2,998,150 | 1,710.900 | 3,396,145 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 4.750 | 7,555 | 443.690 | 705,465 | 448.440 | 713,020 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 178.100 | 198,855 | 6,377.550 | 7,132,080 | 6,555.650 | 7,330,935 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 3.500 | 4,535 | 54.000 | 69,930 | 57.500 | 74,465 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 382.050 | 380,140 | 382.050 | 380,140 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 58.260 | 42,530 | 58.260 | 42,530 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 523.930 | 899,730 | 11,174.740 | 16,318,100 | 11,698.670 | 17,217,830 |

Grass

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.320 | 340 | 13.460 | 14,270 | 13.780 | 14,610 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 31.150 | 29,280 | 31.150 | 29,280 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,580 | 129.270 | 111,175 | 132.270 | 113,755 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.740 | 8,325 | 10.740 | 8,325 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 130.370 | 88,145 | 130.370 | 88,145 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 49.100 | 29,215 | 49.100 | 29,215 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 133.000 | 75,145 | 133.000 | 75,145 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 1,530 | 36.000 | 18,360 | 39.000 | 19,890 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 6.320 | 4,450 | 533.090 | 373,915 | 539.410 | 378,365 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 31.630 | 6,325 | 1,475.540 | 290,735 | 1,507.170 | 297,060 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 973.010 | 1,733,565 | 17,938.310 | 24,523,095 | 18,911.320 | 26,256,660 |
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| County 89 - Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  | Market Area: 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Acres | Total |  |  |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 27.000 | 65,475 | 27.000 | 65,475 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 154.520 | 300,540 | 154.520 | 300,540 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 168.030 | 285,650 | 168.030 | 285,650 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 1,190 | 1.000 | 1,190 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 12,220 | 13.000 | 12,220 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 7,650 | 9.000 | 7,650 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 372.550 | 672,725 | 372.550 | 672,725 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 45.500 | 97,825 | 399.180 | 858,235 | 444.680 | 956,060 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 29,610 | 174.230 | 368,505 | 188.230 | 398,115 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 166.030 | 329,585 | 554.270 | 1,100,240 | 720.300 | 1,429,825 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 25.630 | 40,750 | 165.790 | 263,605 | 191.420 | 304,355 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 10,560 | 58.750 | 77,550 | 66.750 | 88,110 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 16,835 | 117.890 | 152,670 | 130.890 | 169,505 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 46.000 | 45,770 | 156.170 | 155,390 | 202.170 | 201,160 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 15.000 | 10,950 | 106.960 | 78,080 | 121.960 | 89,030 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 333.160 | 581,885 | 1,733.240 | 3,054,275 | 2,066.400 | 3,636,160 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 74.210 | 78,665 | 74.210 | 78,665 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 14.280 | 13,420 | 14.280 | 13,420 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 9,460 | 52.780 | 45,390 | 63.780 | 54,850 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 38.000 | 29,450 | 38.000 | 29,450 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,380 | 2.000 | 1,380 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 1,785 | 24.000 | 14,280 | 27.000 | 16,065 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.000 | 5,650 | 74.360 | 42,015 | 84.360 | 47,665 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 20.000 | 10,200 | 131.950 | 67,290 | 151.950 | 77,490 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 44.000 | 27,095 | 411.580 | 291,890 | 455.580 | 318,985 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 167.490 | 22,105 | 1,840.490 | 303,045 | 2,007.980 | 325,150 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 544.650 | 631,085 | 4,357.860 | 4,321,935 | 4,902.510 | 4,953,020 |
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| County 89 | gton | County 89 - Washington 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: |  |  |  |
|  | Urb |  | SubU |  | Ru |  | Tot |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 113.150 | 274,390 | 226.710 | 549,775 | 339.860 | 824,165 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 29.000 | 68,585 | 73.000 | 172,650 | 102.000 | 241,235 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.600 | 139,260 | 45.000 | 87,525 | 116.600 | 226,785 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 80.850 | 137,445 | 80.850 | 137,445 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 6.460 | 9,430 | 11.000 | 16,060 | 17.460 | 25,490 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 27.000 | 32,130 | 94.500 | 112,455 | 121.500 | 144,585 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 23.500 | 22,090 | 43.200 | 40,610 | 66.700 | 62,700 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 12.000 | 10,200 | 12.000 | 10,200 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 270.710 | 545,885 | 586.260 | 1,126,720 | 856.970 | 1,672,605 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 538.700 | 1,158,205 | 4,916.820 | 10,571,150 | 5,455.520 | 11,729,355 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 219.410 | 464,055 | 4,844.090 | 10,245,360 | 5,063.500 | 10,709,415 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 329.340 | 653,745 | 3,400.430 | 6,749,910 | 3,729.770 | 7,403,655 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 7,950 | 593.320 | 943,385 | 598.320 | 951,335 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.000 | 13,200 | 224.020 | 295,705 | 234.020 | 308,905 |
| 59. 3D | 0.000 | 0 | 344.480 | 446,110 | 5,057.770 | 6,549,850 | 5,402.250 | 6,995,960 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 452.760 | 450,505 | 4,331.340 | 4,309,715 | 4,784.100 | 4,760,220 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 334.390 | 244,105 | 2,966.940 | 2,165,850 | 3,301.330 | 2,409,955 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,234.080 | 3,437,875 | 26,334.730 | 41,830,925 | 28,568.810 | 45,268,800 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 9,540 | 245.850 | 260,600 | 254.850 | 270,140 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 199.490 | 187,520 | 199.490 | 187,520 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,580 | 31.000 | 26,660 | 34.000 | 29,240 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 40.300 | 31,235 | 40.300 | 31,235 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 19.850 | 13,695 | 19.850 | 13,695 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 192.980 | 114,825 | 192.980 | 114,825 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 4,520 | 138.000 | 77,970 | 146.000 | 82,490 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 43.500 | 22,185 | 43.500 | 22,185 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 20.000 | 16,640 | 910.970 | 734,690 | 930.970 | 751,330 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 70.310 | 14,060 | 580.580 | 114,120 | 650.890 | 128,180 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,595.100 | 4,014,460 | 28,412.540 | 43,806,455 | 31,007.640 | 47,820,915 |
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## County 89 - Washington <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 7,275 | 3.000 | 7,275 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 12.000 | 28,380 | 12.000 | 28,380 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 11,900 | 7.000 | 11,900 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 22.000 | 47,555 | 22.000 | 47,555 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 170.930 | 389,210 | 253.350 | 544,705 | 424.280 | 933,915 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 125.190 | 313,555 | 1,156.390 | 2,445,755 | 1,281.580 | 2,759,310 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 127.670 | 253,440 | 402.410 | 798,810 | 530.080 | 1,052,250 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 22.370 | 35,570 | 457.460 | 727,350 | 479.830 | 762,920 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 9,240 | 111.530 | 259,225 | 118.530 | 268,465 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 120.140 | 155,575 | 785.670 | 1,064,935 | 905.810 | 1,220,510 |
| 60.4 D 1 | 0.000 | 0 | 174.940 | 174,065 | 1,663.570 | 1,668,025 | 1,838.510 | 1,842,090 |
| 61. 4D | 0.000 | 0 | 198.630 | 203,765 | 1,315.090 | 1,100,720 | 1,513.720 | 1,304,485 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 946.870 | 1,534,420 | 6,145.470 | 8,609,525 | 7,092.340 | 10,143,945 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 3,180 | 32.720 | 34,685 | 35.720 | 37,865 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 25.000 | 23,500 | 171.280 | 161,005 | 196.280 | 184,505 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 39.850 | 34,270 | 39.850 | 34,270 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 4,650 | 89.090 | 69,045 | 95.090 | 73,695 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,070 | 17.000 | 11,730 | 20.000 | 13,800 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 13.920 | 8,285 | 105.330 | 62,675 | 119.250 | 70,960 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 44.160 | 24,955 | 373.830 | 211,205 | 417.990 | 236,160 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 24.980 | 12,740 | 440.830 | 224,835 | 465.810 | 237,575 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 120.060 | 79,380 | 1,269.930 | 809,450 | 1,389.990 | 888,830 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 194.320 | 94,395 | 1,566.820 | 499,735 | 1,761.140 | 594,130 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 600 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 600 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 5.230 |  | 5.230 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,264.250 | 1,708,795 | 9,004.220 | 9,966,265 | 10,268.470 | 11,675,060 |


| County 89 - Washington |  |  | unty Abst | Assessm | r Real P | , Form 4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market A | 7 |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | $\begin{gathered} \text { SubU } \\ \text { Acres } \end{gathered}$ | Value | Rural |  |  | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 134.500 | 326,165 | 134.500 | 326,165 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 61.000 | 144,265 | 59.000 | 139,535 | 120.000 | 283,800 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 343.650 | 668,400 | 343.650 | 668,400 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 8,500 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 8,500 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 551.590 | 805,320 | 551.590 | 805,320 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 66.000 | 152,765 | 1,088.740 | 1,939,420 | 1,154.740 | 2,092,185 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 117.000 | 251,550 | 509.610 | 1,095,670 | 626.610 | 1,347,220 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 258.340 | 546,380 | 432.160 | 914,010 | 690.500 | 1,460,390 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 504.370 | 1,001,160 | 1,013.180 | 2,006,115 | 1,517.550 | 3,007,275 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 145.530 | 231,395 | 117.830 | 187,350 | 263.360 | 418,745 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 98.980 | 130,655 | 997.320 | 1,286,950 | 1,096.300 | 1,417,605 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 3,885 | 3.000 | 3,885 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 65.000 | 64,675 | 311.130 | 309,575 | 376.130 | 374,250 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 15.000 | 10,950 | 17.280 | 12,615 | 32.280 | 23,565 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,204.220 | 2,236,765 | 3,401.510 | 5,816,170 | 4,605.730 | 8,052,935 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 2,120 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 2,120 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 13,160 | 15.340 | 14,420 | 29.340 | 27,580 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 6,880 | 9.000 | 7,740 | 17.000 | 14,620 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 6,200 | 13.500 | 10,465 | 21.500 | 16,665 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 12.000 | 8,280 | 12.000 | 8,280 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 32.000 | 18,080 | 26.500 | 14,975 | 58.500 | 33,055 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 2,550 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 2,550 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 69.000 | 48,990 | 76.340 | 55,880 | 145.340 | 104,870 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 306.010 | 61,205 | 397.280 | 65,200 | 703.290 | 126,405 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 1,645.230 | 2,499,725 | 4,963.870 | 7,876,670 | 6,609.100 | 10,376,395 |


| County 89 - Washington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market Area: 8 |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | SubUrban Acres | Value | Rural <br> Acres | Value | Tota <br> Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.050 | 23,760 | 159.320 | 342,535 | 170.370 | 366,295 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 27.000 | 57,105 | 261.590 | 553,265 | 288.590 | 610,370 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 17.000 | 33,745 | 127.410 | 252,910 | 144.410 | 286,655 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 4,770 | 137.500 | 218,625 | 140.500 | 223,395 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 67.000 | 88,120 | 67.000 | 88,120 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 17.090 | 22,130 | 76.000 | 98,420 | 93.090 | 120,550 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 33.610 | 33,435 | 521.750 | 519,145 | 555.360 | 552,580 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 16.370 | 11,950 | 290.760 | 212,265 | 307.130 | 224,215 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 125.120 | 186,895 | 1,641.330 | 2,285,285 | 1,766.450 | 2,472,180 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 30.000 | 28,200 | 30.000 | 28,200 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.800 | 3,270 | 3.800 | 3,270 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 15.000 | 11,625 | 15.000 | 11,625 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,190 | 2.000 | 1,190 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 69.440 | 39,235 | 69.440 | 39,235 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 93.550 | 47,715 | 93.550 | 47,715 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 213.790 | 131,235 | 213.790 | 131,235 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 19.000 | 3,800 | 203.790 | 40,760 | 222.790 | 44,560 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 144.120 | 190,695 | 2,058.910 | 2,457,280 | 2,203.030 | 2,647,975 |
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| County 89 - Washington 200 |  |  | County 89 - Washington 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market A | 10 |  |  |
|  |  |  | SubU |  | Rural |  | Tot |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 72.510 | 155,895 | 108.510 | 233,300 | 181.020 | 389,195 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 154.770 | 327,340 | 255.350 | 540,060 | 410.120 | 867,400 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 90.770 | 180,180 | 324.310 | 643,760 | 415.080 | 823,940 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 41.300 | 65,665 | 146.900 | 233,575 | 188.200 | 299,240 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 112.870 | 115,085 | 193.800 | 207,760 | 306.670 | 322,845 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 18.230 | 23,610 | 88.510 | 114,620 | 106.740 | 138,230 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 93.310 | 92,845 | 300.210 | 298,715 | 393.520 | 391,560 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 56.630 | 41,340 | 267.430 | 195,210 | 324.060 | 236,550 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 640.390 | 1,001,960 | 1,685.020 | 2,467,000 | 2,325.410 | 3,468,960 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 5,300 | 5.000 | 5,300 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 6,580 | 49.500 | 46,530 | 56.500 | 53,110 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 860 | 1.000 | 860 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 775 | 4.000 | 3,100 | 5.000 | 3,875 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 690 | 1.000 | 690 | 2.000 | 1,380 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,190 | 42.000 | 24,990 | 44.000 | 26,180 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 56.830 | 32,110 | 143.640 | 81,165 | 200.470 | 113,275 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 52.320 | 26,685 | 194.440 | 99,160 | 246.760 | 125,845 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 120.150 | 68,030 | 440.580 | 261,795 | 560.730 | 329,825 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 39.010 | 7,800 | 206.250 | 41,250 | 245.260 | 49,050 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 799.550 | 1,077,790 | 2,331.850 | 2,770,045 | 3,131.400 | 3,847,835 |
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|  |  |  | 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market | 11 | Total |  |
|  |  |  | SubU |  | Rural |  |  |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 10,750 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 10,750 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 6.400 | 13,535 | 26.850 | 56,790 | 33.250 | 70,325 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 15.000 | 29,775 | 15.000 | 29,775 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 39.090 | 62,155 | 35.010 | 55,665 | 74.100 | 117,820 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.020 | 6,625 | 5.020 | 6,625 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 4.000 | 5,180 | 52.620 | 68,145 | 56.620 | 73,325 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.100 | 8,060 | 68.420 | 68,080 | 76.520 | 76,140 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 8,030 | 42.800 | 31,245 | 53.800 | 39,275 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 73.590 | 107,710 | 245.720 | 316,325 | 319.310 | 424,035 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.700 | 11,000 | 11.700 | 11,000 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.780 | 10,680 | 13.780 | 10,680 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,190 | 2.000 | 1,190 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 13.000 | 7,345 | 13.000 | 7,345 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 26.000 | 13,260 | 26.000 | 13,260 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 66.480 | 43,475 | 66.480 | 43,475 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 6.910 | 1,380 | 57.120 | 11,415 | 64.030 | 12,795 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 80.500 | 109,090 | 369.320 | 371,215 | 449.820 | 480,305 |
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| County 89 - Washington 20 |  |  | County 89 - Washington 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market A | 12 |  |  |
|  |  |  | SubU |  | Rural |  | To |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.080 | 152,820 | 1,571.330 | 3,378,310 | 1,642.410 | 3,531,130 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 23.000 | 48,645 | 1,950.050 | 4,124,395 | 1,973.050 | 4,173,040 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 140.000 | 277,905 | 349.330 | 693,435 | 489.330 | 971,340 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 24.000 | 38,160 | 0.000 | 0 | 24.000 | 38,160 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.000 | 13,200 | 10.000 | 13,200 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 81.550 | 105,610 | 1,517.550 | 1,965,240 | 1,599.100 | 2,070,850 |
| 60. 4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 58.980 | 58,685 | 782.600 | 778,705 | 841.580 | 837,390 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 7.000 | 5,110 | 611.840 | 446,645 | 618.840 | 451,755 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 405.610 | 686,935 | 6,792.700 | 11,399,930 | 7,198.310 | 12,086,865 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 9.000 | 9,540 | 63.100 | 66,885 | 72.100 | 76,425 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 12.000 | 11,280 | 123.000 | 115,620 | 135.000 | 126,900 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 23.000 | 19,780 | 23.000 | 19,780 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 9,660 | 14.000 | 9,660 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 12.580 | 7,485 | 83.290 | 49,560 | 95.870 | 57,045 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 6.000 | 3,390 | 78.300 | 44,240 | 84.300 | 47,630 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 71.000 | 36,210 | 71.000 | 36,210 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 39.580 | 31,695 | 455.690 | 341,955 | 495.270 | 373,650 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 118.100 | 18,000 | 324.030 | 64,805 | 442.130 | 82,805 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 563.290 | 736,630 | 7,572.420 | 11,806,690 | 8,135.710 | 12,543,320 |
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| County 89 - Washington |  |  | 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market | 13 |  |  |
| Irrigated: |  | Value | Subu | Value | Rural |  | Total |  |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | Value | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | Value | Acres 0.000 | Value |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 10,750 | 5.000 | 10,750 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 7,950 | 5.000 | 7,950 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 61.4D | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 10.000 | 18,700 | 10.000 | 18,700 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 136.000 | 21,400 | 136.000 | 21,400 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 146.000 | 40,100 | 146.000 | 40,100 |
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## County 89 - Washington <br> 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail
Market Area:
26

| Irrigated: | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 7.500 | 18,190 | 16.500 | 40,015 | 24.000 | 58,205 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 18.500 | 43,755 | 4.500 | 10,645 | 23.000 | 54,400 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 5.000 | 9,725 | 21.500 | 41,820 | 26.500 | 51,545 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 3,400 | 2.000 | 3,400 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.500 | 4,165 | 3.500 | 4,165 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 25.500 | 23,970 | 12.000 | 11,280 | 37.500 | 35,250 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 17.500 | 14,875 | 24.000 | 20,400 | 41.500 | 35,275 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 74.000 | 110,515 | 84.000 | 131,725 | 158.000 | 242,240 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54. 1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 439.700 | 945,360 | 1,556.530 | 3,346,560 | 1,996.230 | 4,291,920 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 388.910 | 822,545 | 4,889.050 | 10,340,440 | 5,277.960 | 11,162,985 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 400.760 | 795,520 | 2,095.460 | 4,159,580 | 2,496.220 | 4,955,100 |
| 57. 2D | 0.000 | 0 | 175.990 | 279,825 | 1,827.390 | 2,905,560 | 2,003.380 | 3,185,385 |
| 58. 3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 45.000 | 55,175 | 303.570 | 355,250 | 348.570 | 410,425 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 401.300 | 519,690 | 3,011.400 | 3,899,830 | 3,412.700 | 4,419,520 |
| 60.4 D 1 | 0.000 | 0 | 481.670 | 479,275 | 6,351.690 | 6,320,055 | 6,833.360 | 6,799,330 |
| 61. 4D | 0.000 | 0 | 546.760 | 399,150 | 3,846.620 | 2,808,070 | 4,393.380 | 3,207,220 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 2,880.090 | 4,296,540 | 23,881.710 | 34,135,345 | 26,761.800 | 38,431,885 |

Grass:

| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 8.000 | 8,480 | 151.500 | 160,590 | 159.500 | 169,070 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64. 1G | 0.000 | 0 | 66.170 | 62,200 | 494.350 | 464,695 | 560.520 | 526,895 |
| 65. 2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 22.500 | 19,350 | 52.720 | 45,340 | 75.220 | 64,690 |
| 66. 2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 189.900 | 147,185 | 189.900 | 147,185 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 15.000 | 10,350 | 37.000 | 25,530 | 52.000 | 35,880 |
| 68.3G | 0.000 | 0 | 71.980 | 42,830 | 269.040 | 160,085 | 341.020 | 202,915 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 44.500 | 25,145 | 931.090 | 526,085 | 975.590 | 551,230 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 187.890 | 95,820 | 1,418.220 | 1,323,480 | 1,606.110 | 1,419,300 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 416.040 | 264,175 | 3,543.820 | 2,852,990 | 3,959.860 | 3,117,165 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 239.280 | 47,860 | 2,916.060 | 583,225 | 3,155.340 | 631,085 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 3,609.410 | 4,719,090 | 30,425.590 | 37,703,285 | 34,035.000 | 42,422,375 |
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| County 89 - Washington |  |  | 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Schedule IX: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Detail |  |  |  |  | Market A | 31 |  |  |
|  |  |  | SubU |  | Rural |  | Tot |  |
| Irrigated: | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 45. 1A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 46. 1A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 47. 2A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 48. 2A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 49. 3A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 50. 3A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 51. 4A1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 52. 4A | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 53. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| Dryland: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 54.1D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 51.000 | 109,650 | 41.000 | 88,150 | 92.000 | 197,800 |
| 55.1D | 0.000 | 0 | 67.910 | 143,630 | 206.630 | 437,025 | 274.540 | 580,655 |
| 56. 2D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 36.270 | 71,995 | 157.500 | 312,640 | 193.770 | 384,635 |
| 57.2D | 0.000 | 0 | 31.000 | 49,290 | 83.770 | 133,195 | 114.770 | 182,485 |
| 58.3D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 123.080 | 162,465 | 123.080 | 162,465 |
| 59.3D | 0.000 | 0 | 31.700 | 41,050 | 49.990 | 64,735 | 81.690 | 105,785 |
| 60.4D1 | 0.000 | 0 | 80.000 | 79,600 | 334.500 | 332,830 | 414.500 | 412,430 |
| 61. 4D | 0.000 | 0 | 85.000 | 62,050 | 156.540 | 114,275 | 241.540 | 176,325 |
| 62. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 382.880 | 557,265 | 1,153.010 | 1,645,315 | 1,535.890 | 2,202,580 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.1G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 4.000 | 4,240 | 5.000 | 5,300 | 9.000 | 9,540 |
| 64.1G | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 2,820 | 61.600 | 57,905 | 64.600 | 60,725 |
| 65.2G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 1.000 | 860 | 1.000 | 860 | 2.000 | 1,720 |
| 66.2G | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 30.000 | 23,250 | 30.000 | 23,250 |
| 67.3G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 11.000 | 7,590 | 11.000 | 7,590 |
| 68. 3G | 0.000 | 0 | 2.000 | 1,190 | 16.750 | 9,965 | 18.750 | 11,155 |
| 69.4G1 | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 1,695 | 116.270 | 65,690 | 119.270 | 67,385 |
| 70.4G | 0.000 | 0 | 14.000 | 7,140 | 216.040 | 110,185 | 230.040 | 117,325 |
| 71. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 27.000 | 17,945 | 457.660 | 280,745 | 484.660 | 298,690 |
| 72. Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 24.790 | 4,960 | 182.740 | 36,545 | 207.530 | 41,505 |
| 73. Other | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 |
| 74. Exempt | 0.000 |  | 0.000 |  | 640.000 |  | 640.000 |  |
| 75. Total | 0.000 | 0 | 434.670 | 580,170 | 1,793.410 | 1,962,605 | 2,228.080 | 2,542,775 |

## County 89 - Washington

2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Schedule X: Agricultural Records: AgLand Market Area Totals

|  | Urban |  | SubUrban |  | Rural |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AgLand | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value | Acres | Value |
| 76.Irrigated | 0.000 | 0 | 1,130.050 | 2,233,410 | 9,836.700 | 16,581,855 | 10,966.750 | 18,815,265 |
| 77.Dry Land | 0.000 | 0 | 11,894.800 | 18,952,190 | 158,046.000 | 242,477,080 | 169,940.800 | 261,429,270 |
| 78.Grass | 0.000 | 0 | 1,140.320 | 751,295 | 15,441.830 | 11,184,910 | 16,582.150 | 11,936,205 |
| 79.Waste | 0.000 | 0 | 1,513.690 | 335,455 | 13,213.450 | 2,741,340 | 14,727.140 | 3,076,795 |
| 80.Other | 0.000 | 0 | 3.000 | 600 | 1.500 | 300 | 4.500 | 900 |
| 81.Exempt | 0.000 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 654.380 | 0 | 654.380 | 0 |
| 82.Total | 0.000 | 0 | 15,681.860 | 22,272,950 | 196,539.480 | 272,985,485 | 212,221.340 | 295,258,435 |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |
| 1A |
| 2A1 of Acres* |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 116.990 | 18.37\% | 283,705 | 24.23\% | 2,425.036 |
| 1A | 47.500 | 7.46\% | 112,340 | 9.59\% | 2,365.052 |
| 2 A 1 | 205.000 | 32.19\% | 398,725 | 34.05\% | 1,945.000 |
| 2A | 78.720 | 12.36\% | 133,825 | 11.43\% | 1,700.012 |
| 3A1 | 115.620 | 18.16\% | 168,805 | 14.42\% | 1,459.998 |
| 3A | 24.000 | 3.77\% | 28,560 | 2.44\% | 1,190.000 |
| 4 A 1 | 36.000 | 5.65\% | 33,840 | 2.89\% | 940.000 |
| 4A | 13.000 | 2.04\% | 11,050 | 0.94\% | 850.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 636.830 | 100.00\% | 1,170,850 | 100.00\% | 1,838.559 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 1,204.520 | 8.18\% | 2,589,720 | 12.71\% | 2,150.001 |
| 1D | 2,684.290 | 18.24\% | 5,677,285 | 27.85\% | 2,115.004 |
| 2D1 | 288.010 | 1.96\% | 571,700 | 2.80\% | 1,985.000 |
| 2D | 1,750.660 | 11.89\% | 2,783,550 | 13.66\% | 1,590.000 |
| 3D1 | 44.500 | 0.30\% | 58,740 | 0.29\% | 1,320.000 |
| 3D | 1,353.210 | 9.19\% | 1,752,415 | 8.60\% | 1,295.005 |
| 4D1 | 5,856.460 | 39.79\% | 5,827,245 | 28.59\% | 995.011 |
| 4D | 1,537.500 | 10.45\% | 1,122,380 | 5.51\% | 730.003 |
| Dry Total | 14,719.150 | 100.00\% | 20,383,035 | 100.00\% | 1,384.797 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 50.000 | 1.88\% | 53,000 | 3.16\% | 1,060.000 |
| 1G | 418.340 | 15.74\% | 393,235 | 23.42\% | 939.989 |
| 2G1 | 7.000 | 0.26\% | 6,020 | 0.36\% | 860.000 |
| 2G | 124.790 | 4.69\% | 96,715 | 5.76\% | 775.022 |
| 3G1 | 15.500 | 0.58\% | 10,695 | 0.64\% | 690.000 |
| 3G | 142.000 | 5.34\% | 84,490 | 5.03\% | 595.000 |
| 4G1 | 1,185.570 | 44.60\% | 669,850 | 39.90\% | 565.002 |
| 4G | 715.230 | 26.90\% | 364,765 | 21.73\% | 509.996 |
| Grass Total | 2,658.430 | 100.00\% | 1,678,770 | 100.00\% | 631.489 |
| Irrigated Total | 636.830 | 3.25\% | 1,170,850 | 4.97\% | 1,838.559 |
| Dry Total | 14,719.150 | 75.10\% | 20,383,035 | 86.55\% | 1,384.797 |
| Grass Total | 2,658.430 | 13.56\% | 1,678,770 | 7.13\% | 631.489 |
| Waste | 1,584.490 | 8.08\% | 316,905 | 1.35\% | 200.004 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 19,598.900 | 100.00\% | 23,549,560 | 100.00\% | 1,201.575 |
| As Related to the County as a Whole |  |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated Total | 636.830 | 5.81\% | 1,170,850 | 6.22\% |  |
| Dry Total | 14,719.150 | 8.66\% | 20,383,035 | 7.80\% |  |
| Grass Total | 2,658.430 | 16.03\% | 1,678,770 | 14.06\% |  |
| Waste | 1,584.490 | 10.76\% | 316,905 | 10.30\% |  |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |  |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 19,598.900 | 9.24\% | 23,549,560 | 7.98\% |  |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington
Market Area: 3

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 295.900 | 5.73\% | 717,560 | 8.58\% | 2,425.008 |
| 1A | 733.470 | 14.20\% | 1,734,665 | 20.74\% | 2,365.011 |
| 2A1 | 1,164.410 | 22.54\% | 2,264,790 | 27.08\% | 1,945.010 |
| 2A | 17.000 | 0.33\% | 28,900 | 0.35\% | 1,700.000 |
| 3A1 | 2,835.520 | 54.89\% | 3,492,840 | 41.76\% | 1,231.816 |
| 3A | 48.270 | 0.93\% | 57,440 | 0.69\% | 1,189.973 |
| 4A1 | 71.500 | 1.38\% | 67,210 | 0.80\% | 940.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 5,166.070 | 100.00\% | 8,363,405 | 100.00\% | 1,618.910 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 656.430 | 5.61\% | 1,411,330 | 8.20\% | 2,150.008 |
| 1D | 1,829.440 | 15.64\% | 3,869,265 | 22.47\% | 2,114.999 |
| 2D1 | 1,710.900 | 14.62\% | 3,396,145 | 19.72\% | 1,985.004 |
| 2D | 448.440 | 3.83\% | 713,020 | 4.14\% | 1,590.000 |
| 3D1 | 6,555.650 | 56.04\% | 7,330,935 | 42.58\% | 1,118.262 |
| 3D | 57.500 | 0.49\% | 74,465 | 0.43\% | 1,295.043 |
| 4D1 | 382.050 | 3.27\% | 380,140 | 2.21\% | 995.000 |
| 4D | 58.260 | 0.50\% | 42,530 | 0.25\% | 730.003 |
| Dry Total | 11,698.670 | 100.00\% | 17,217,830 | 100.00\% | 1,471.776 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 13.780 | $2.55 \%$ | 14,610 | $3.86 \%$ | $1,060.232$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 31.150 | $5.77 \%$ | 29,280 | $7.74 \%$ | 939.967 |
| 2G1 | 132.270 | $24.52 \%$ | 113,755 | $30.06 \%$ | 860.021 |
| 2G | 10.740 | $1.99 \%$ | 8,325 | $2.20 \%$ | 775.139 |
| 3G1 | 130.370 | $24.17 \%$ | 88,145 | $23.30 \%$ | 676.114 |
| 3G | 49.100 | $9.10 \%$ | 29,215 | $7.72 \%$ | 595.010 |
| 4G1 | 133.000 | $24.66 \%$ | 75,145 | $19.86 \%$ | 565.000 |
| 4G | 39.000 | $7.23 \%$ | 19,890 | $5.26 \%$ | 510.000 |
| Grass Total | 539.410 | $100.00 \%$ | 378,365 | $100.00 \%$ | 701.442 |
|  | $5,166.070$ | $27.32 \%$ | $8,363,405$ | $31.85 \%$ | $1,618.910$ |
| Irrigated Total | $11,698.670$ | $61.86 \%$ | $17,217,830$ | $65.58 \%$ | $1,471.776$ |
| Dry Total | 539.410 | $2.85 \%$ | 378,365 | $1.44 \%$ | 701.442 |
| Grass Total | $1,507.170$ | $7.97 \%$ | 297,060 | $1.13 \%$ | 197.097 |
| Waste | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 0.000 |
| Exempt | $18,911.320$ | $100.00 \%$ | $26,256,660$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |
| Market Area Total |  |  |  | $1,388.409$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | $5,166.070$ | $47.11 \%$ | $8,363,405$ | $44.45 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $11,698.670$ | $6.88 \%$ | $17,217,830$ | $6.59 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 539.410 | $3.25 \%$ | 378,365 | $3.17 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,507.170$ | $10.23 \%$ | 297,060 | $9.65 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $18,911.320$ | $8.91 \%$ | $26,256,660$ | $8.89 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 27.000 | 7.25\% | 65,475 | 9.73\% | 2,425.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 154.520 | 41.48\% | 300,540 | 44.68\% | 1,944.990 |
| 2A | 168.030 | 45.10\% | 285,650 | 42.46\% | 1,699.994 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 1.000 | 0.27\% | 1,190 | 0.18\% | 1,190.000 |
| 4A1 | 13.000 | 3.49\% | 12,220 | 1.82\% | 940.000 |
| 4A | 9.000 | 2.42\% | 7,650 | 1.14\% | 850.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 372.550 | 100.00\% | 672,725 | 100.00\% | 1,805.730 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 444.680 | 21.52\% | 956,060 | 26.29\% | 2,149.995 |
| 1D | 188.230 | 9.11\% | 398,115 | 10.95\% | 2,115.045 |
| 2D1 | 720.300 | 34.86\% | 1,429,825 | 39.32\% | 1,985.040 |
| 2D | 191.420 | 9.26\% | 304,355 | 8.37\% | 1,589.985 |
| 3D1 | 66.750 | 3.23\% | 88,110 | 2.42\% | 1,320.000 |
| 3D | 130.890 | 6.33\% | 169,505 | 4.66\% | 1,295.018 |
| 4D1 | 202.170 | 9.78\% | 201,160 | 5.53\% | 995.004 |
| 4D | 121.960 | 5.90\% | 89,030 | 2.45\% | 729.993 |
| Dry Total | 2,066.400 | 100.00\% | 3,636,160 | 100.00\% | 1,759.659 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 74.210 | 16.29\% | 78,665 | 24.66\% | 1,060.032 |
| 1G | 14.280 | 3.13\% | 13,420 | 4.21\% | 939.775 |
| 2G1 | 63.780 | 14.00\% | 54,850 | 17.20\% | 859.987 |
| 2G | 38.000 | 8.34\% | 29,450 | 9.23\% | 775.000 |
| 3G1 | 2.000 | 0.44\% | 1,380 | 0.43\% | 690.000 |
| 3G | 27.000 | 5.93\% | 16,065 | 5.04\% | 595.000 |
| 4G1 | 84.360 | 18.52\% | 47,665 | 14.94\% | 565.018 |
| 4G | 151.950 | 33.35\% | 77,490 | 24.29\% | 509.970 |
| Grass Total | 455.580 | 100.00\% | 318,985 | 100.00\% | 700.173 |
| Irrigated Total | 372.550 | 7.60\% | 672,725 | 13.58\% | 1,805.730 |
| Dry Total | 2,066.400 | 42.15\% | 3,636,160 | 73.41\% | 1,759.659 |
| Grass Total | 455.580 | 9.29\% | 318,985 | 6.44\% | 700.173 |
| Waste | 2,007.980 | 40.96\% | 325,150 | 6.56\% | 161.928 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 4,902.510 | 100.00\% | 4,953,020 | 100.00\% | 1,010.302 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 372.550 | $3.40 \%$ | 672,725 | $3.58 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,066.400$ | $1.22 \%$ | $3,636,160$ | $1.39 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 455.580 | $2.75 \%$ | 318,985 | $2.67 \%$ |
| Waste | $2,007.980$ | $13.63 \%$ | 325,150 | $10.57 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $4,902.510$ | $2.31 \%$ | $4,953,020$ | $1.68 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

Market Area: 5

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 339.860 | 39.66\% | 824,165 | 49.27\% | 2,425.013 |
| 1A | 102.000 | 11.90\% | 241,235 | 14.42\% | 2,365.049 |
| 2A1 | 116.600 | 13.61\% | 226,785 | 13.56\% | 1,944.982 |
| 2A | 80.850 | 9.43\% | 137,445 | 8.22\% | 1,700.000 |
| 3 A 1 | 17.460 | 2.04\% | 25,490 | 1.52\% | 1,459.908 |
| 3A | 121.500 | 14.18\% | 144,585 | 8.64\% | 1,190.000 |
| 4A1 | 66.700 | 7.78\% | 62,700 | 3.75\% | 940.029 |
| 4A | 12.000 | 1.40\% | 10,200 | 0.61\% | 850.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 856.970 | 100.00\% | 1,672,605 | 100.00\% | 1,951.766 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 5,455.520 | 19.10\% | 11,729,355 | 25.91\% | 2,149.997 |
| 1D | 5,063.500 | 17.72\% | 10,709,415 | 23.66\% | 2,115.022 |
| 2D1 | 3,729.770 | 13.06\% | 7,403,655 | 16.35\% | 1,985.016 |
| 2D | 598.320 | 2.09\% | 951,335 | 2.10\% | 1,590.010 |
| 3D1 | 234.020 | 0.82\% | 308,905 | 0.68\% | 1,319.994 |
| 3D | 5,402.250 | 18.91\% | 6,995,960 | 15.45\% | 1,295.008 |
| 4D1 | 4,784.100 | 16.75\% | 4,760,220 | 10.52\% | 995.008 |
| 4D | 3,301.330 | 11.56\% | 2,409,955 | 5.32\% | 729.995 |
| Dry Total | 28,568.810 | 100.00\% | 45,268,800 | 100.00\% | 1,584.553 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 254.850 | 27.37\% | 270,140 | 35.95\% | 1,059.996 |
| 1G | 199.490 | 21.43\% | 187,520 | 24.96\% | 939.996 |
| 2G1 | 34.000 | 3.65\% | 29,240 | 3.89\% | 860.000 |
| 2G | 40.300 | 4.33\% | 31,235 | 4.16\% | 775.062 |
| 3G1 | 19.850 | 2.13\% | 13,695 | 1.82\% | 689.924 |
| 3G | 192.980 | 20.73\% | 114,825 | 15.28\% | 595.009 |
| 4G1 | 146.000 | 15.68\% | 82,490 | 10.98\% | 565.000 |
| 4G | 43.500 | 4.67\% | 22,185 | 2.95\% | 510.000 |
| Grass Total | 930.970 | 100.00\% | 751,330 | 100.00\% | 807.039 |
| Irrigated Total | 856.970 | 2.76\% | 1,672,605 | 3.50\% | 1,951.766 |
| Dry Total | 28,568.810 | 92.13\% | 45,268,800 | 94.66\% | 1,584.553 |
| Grass Total | 930.970 | 3.00\% | 751,330 | 1.57\% | 807.039 |
| Waste | 650.890 | 2.10\% | 128,180 | 0.27\% | 196.930 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 31,007.640 | 100.00\% | 47,820,915 | 100.00\% | 1,542.230 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 856.970 | $7.81 \%$ | $1,672,605$ | $8.89 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $28,568.810$ | $16.81 \%$ | $45,268,800$ | $17.32 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 930.970 | $5.61 \%$ | 751,330 | $6.29 \%$ |
| Waste | 650.890 | $4.42 \%$ | 128,180 | $4.17 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $31,007.640$ | $14.61 \%$ | $47,820,915$ | $16.20 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 3.000 | 13.64\% | 7,275 | 15.30\% | 2,425.000 |
| 1A | 12.000 | 54.55\% | 28,380 | 59.68\% | 2,365.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 7.000 | 31.82\% | 11,900 | 25.02\% | 1,700.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 22.000 | 100.00\% | 47,555 | 100.00\% | 2,161.590 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 424.280 | 5.98\% | 933,915 | 9.21\% | 2,201.176 |
| 1D | 1,281.580 | 18.07\% | 2,759,310 | 27.20\% | 2,153.053 |
| 2D1 | 530.080 | 7.47\% | 1,052,250 | 10.37\% | 1,985.077 |
| 2D | 479.830 | 6.77\% | 762,920 | 7.52\% | 1,589.979 |
| 3D1 | 118.530 | 1.67\% | 268,465 | 2.65\% | 2,264.954 |
| 3D | 905.810 | 12.77\% | 1,220,510 | 12.03\% | 1,347.423 |
| 4D1 | 1,838.510 | 25.92\% | 1,842,090 | 18.16\% | 1,001.947 |
| 4D | 1,513.720 | 21.34\% | 1,304,485 | 12.86\% | 861.774 |
| Dry Total | 7,092.340 | 100.00\% | 10,143,945 | 100.00\% | 1,430.267 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 35.720 | 2.57\% | 37,865 | 4.26\% | 1,060.050 |
| 1 G | 196.280 | 14.12\% | 184,505 | 20.76\% | 940.009 |
| 2G1 | 39.850 | 2.87\% | 34,270 | 3.86\% | 859.974 |
| 2G | 95.090 | 6.84\% | 73,695 | 8.29\% | 775.002 |
| 3G1 | 20.000 | 1.44\% | 13,800 | 1.55\% | 690.000 |
| 3G | 119.250 | 8.58\% | 70,960 | 7.98\% | 595.052 |
| 4G1 | 417.990 | 30.07\% | 236,160 | 26.57\% | 564.989 |
| 4 G | 465.810 | 33.51\% | 237,575 | 26.73\% | 510.025 |
| Grass Total | 1,389.990 | 100.00\% | 888,830 | 100.00\% | 639.450 |
| Irrigated Total | 22.000 | 0.21\% | 47,555 | 0.41\% | 2,161.590 |
| Dry Total | 7,092.340 | 69.07\% | 10,143,945 | 86.89\% | 1,430.267 |
| Grass Total | 1,389.990 | 13.54\% | 888,830 | 7.61\% | 639.450 |
| Waste | 1,761.140 | 17.15\% | 594,130 | 5.09\% | 337.355 |
| Other | 3.000 | 0.03\% | 600 | 0.01\% | 200.000 |
| Exempt | 5.230 | 0.05\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 10,268.470 | 100.00\% | 11,675,060 | 100.00\% | 1,136.981 |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 22.000 | $0.20 \%$ | 47,555 | $0.25 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $7,092.340$ | $4.17 \%$ | $10,143,945$ | $3.88 \%$ |
| Grass Total | $1,389.990$ | $8.38 \%$ | 888,830 | $7.45 \%$ |
| Waste | $1,761.140$ | $11.96 \%$ | 594,130 | $19.31 \%$ |
| Other | 3.000 | $66.67 \%$ | 600 | $66.67 \%$ |
| Exempt | 5.230 | $0.80 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $10,268.470$ | $4.84 \%$ | $11,675,060$ | $3.95 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 134.500 | 11.65\% | 326,165 | 15.59\% | 2,425.018 |
| 1A | 120.000 | 10.39\% | 283,800 | 13.56\% | 2,365.000 |
| 2A1 | 343.650 | 29.76\% | 668,400 | 31.95\% | 1,945.002 |
| 2A | 5.000 | 0.43\% | 8,500 | 0.41\% | 1,700.000 |
| 3A1 | 551.590 | 47.77\% | 805,320 | 38.49\% | 1,459.997 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4 A 1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 1,154.740 | 100.00\% | 2,092,185 | 100.00\% | 1,811.823 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 626.610 | 13.61\% | 1,347,220 | 16.73\% | 2,150.013 |
| 1D | 690.500 | 14.99\% | 1,460,390 | 18.13\% | 2,114.974 |
| 2D1 | 1,517.550 | 32.95\% | 3,007,275 | 37.34\% | 1,981.664 |
| 2D | 263.360 | 5.72\% | 418,745 | 5.20\% | 1,590.009 |
| 3D1 | 1,096.300 | 23.80\% | 1,417,605 | 17.60\% | 1,293.081 |
| 3D | 3.000 | 0.07\% | 3,885 | 0.05\% | 1,295.000 |
| 4D1 | 376.130 | 8.17\% | 374,250 | 4.65\% | 995.001 |
| 4D | 32.280 | 0.70\% | 23,565 | 0.29\% | 730.018 |
| Dry Total | 4,605.730 | 100.00\% | 8,052,935 | 100.00\% | 1,748.460 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 2.000 | 1.38\% | 2,120 | 2.02\% | 1,060.000 |
| 1G | 29.340 | 20.19\% | 27,580 | 26.30\% | 940.013 |
| 2G1 | 17.000 | 11.70\% | 14,620 | 13.94\% | 860.000 |
| 2G | 21.500 | 14.79\% | 16,665 | 15.89\% | 775.116 |
| 3G1 | 12.000 | 8.26\% | 8,280 | 7.90\% | 690.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4G1 | 58.500 | 40.25\% | 33,055 | 31.52\% | 565.042 |
| 4G | 5.000 | 3.44\% | 2,550 | 2.43\% | 510.000 |
| Grass Total | 145.340 | 100.00\% | 104,870 | 100.00\% | 721.549 |
| Irrigated Total | 1,154.740 | 17.47\% | 2,092,185 | 20.16\% | 1,811.823 |
| Dry Total | 4,605.730 | 69.69\% | 8,052,935 | 77.61\% | 1,748.460 |
| Grass Total | 145.340 | 2.20\% | 104,870 | 1.01\% | 721.549 |
| Waste | 703.290 | 10.64\% | 126,405 | 1.22\% | 179.733 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 6,609.100 | 100.00\% | 10,376,395 | 100.00\% | 1,570.016 |
| As Related to the County as a Whole |  |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated Total | 1,154.740 | 10.53\% | 2,092,185 | 11.12\% |  |
| Dry Total | 4,605.730 | 2.71\% | 8,052,935 | 3.08\% |  |
| Grass Total | 145.340 | 0.88\% | 104,870 | 0.88\% |  |
| Waste | 703.290 | 4.78\% | 126,405 | 4.11\% |  |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |  |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 6,609.100 | 3.11\% | 10,376,395 | 3.51\% |  |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4 A 1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 170.370 | 9.64\% | 366,295 | 14.82\% | 2,149.997 |
| 1D | 288.590 | 16.34\% | 610,370 | 24.69\% | 2,115.007 |
| 2D1 | 144.410 | 8.18\% | 286,655 | 11.60\% | 1,985.007 |
| 2D | 140.500 | 7.95\% | 223,395 | 9.04\% | 1,590.000 |
| 3D1 | 67.000 | 3.79\% | 88,120 | 3.56\% | 1,315.223 |
| 3D | 93.090 | 5.27\% | 120,550 | 4.88\% | 1,294.983 |
| 4D1 | 555.360 | 31.44\% | 552,580 | 22.35\% | 994.994 |
| 4D | 307.130 | 17.39\% | 224,215 | 9.07\% | 730.032 |
| Dry Total | 1,766.450 | 100.00\% | 2,472,180 | 100.00\% | 1,399.518 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 G | 30.000 | $14.03 \%$ | 28,200 | $21.49 \%$ | 940.000 |
| 2G1 | 3.800 | $1.78 \%$ | 3,270 | $2.49 \%$ | 860.526 |
| 2G | 15.000 | $7.02 \%$ | 11,625 | $8.86 \%$ | 775.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | 2.000 | $0.94 \%$ | 1,190 | $0.91 \%$ | 595.000 |
| 4G1 | 69.440 | $32.48 \%$ | 39,235 | $29.90 \%$ | 565.020 |
| $4 G$ | 93.550 | $43.76 \%$ | 47,715 | $36.36 \%$ | 510.048 |
| Grass Total | 213.790 | $100.00 \%$ | 131,235 | $100.00 \%$ | 613.850 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | $1,766.450$ | $80.18 \%$ | $2,472,180$ | $93.36 \%$ | $1,399.518$ |
| Grass Total | 213.790 | $9.70 \%$ | 131,235 | $4.96 \%$ | 613.850 |
| Waste | 222.790 | $10.11 \%$ | 44,560 | $1.68 \%$ | 200.008 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,201.969$ |
| Market Area Total | $2,203.030$ | $100.00 \%$ | $2,647,975$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $1,766.450$ | $1.04 \%$ | $2,472,180$ | $0.95 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 213.790 | $1.29 \%$ | 131,235 | $1.10 \%$ |
| Waste | 222.790 | $1.51 \%$ | 44,560 | $1.45 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $2,203.030$ | $1.04 \%$ | $2,647,975$ | $0.90 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail

## County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 1.000 | 0.40\% | 2,425 | 0.61\% | 2,425.000 |
| 1A | 19.000 | 7.62\% | 44,935 | 11.35\% | 2,365.000 |
| 2A1 | 84.000 | 33.69\% | 163,380 | 41.27\% | 1,945.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 125.000 | 50.14\% | 164,300 | 41.50\% | 1,314.400 |
| 3A | 7.000 | 2.81\% | 8,330 | 2.10\% | 1,190.000 |
| 4A1 | 13.310 | 5.34\% | 12,510 | 3.16\% | 939.894 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 249.310 | 100.00\% | 395,880 | 100.00\% | 1,587.902 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 394.310 | 17.96\% | 847,770 | 26.06\% | 2,150.008 |
| 1D | 244.490 | 11.14\% | 517,095 | 15.89\% | 2,114.994 |
| 2D1 | 192.000 | 8.75\% | 381,120 | 11.71\% | 1,985.000 |
| 2D | 2.750 | 0.13\% | 4,375 | 0.13\% | 1,590.909 |
| 3D1 | 1,259.310 | 57.37\% | 1,401,575 | 43.08\% | 1,112.970 |
| 3D | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 101.280 | 4.61\% | 100,770 | 3.10\% | 994.964 |
| 4D | 1.000 | 0.05\% | 730 | 0.02\% | 730.000 |
| Dry Total | 2,195.140 | 100.00\% | 3,253,435 | 100.00\% | 1,482.108 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $1 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $2 G 1$ | 6.380 | $36.71 \%$ | 5,485 | $41.95 \%$ | 859.717 |
| $2 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 11.000 | $63.29 \%$ | 7,590 | $58.05 \%$ | 690.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $4 G 1$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $4 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 17.380 | $100.00 \%$ | 13,075 | $100.00 \%$ | 752.301 |
| Irrigated Total | 249.310 | $9.57 \%$ | 395,880 | $10.73 \%$ | $1,587.902$ |
| Dry Total | $2,195.140$ | $84.26 \%$ | $3,253,435$ | $88.14 \%$ | $1,482.108$ |
| Grass Total | 17.380 | $0.67 \%$ | 13,075 | $0.35 \%$ | 752.301 |
| Waste | 141.940 | $5.45 \%$ | 28,385 | $0.77 \%$ | 199.978 |
| Other | 1.500 | $0.06 \%$ | 300 | $0.01 \%$ | 200.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,416.772$ |
| Market Area Total | $2,605.270$ | $100.00 \%$ | $3,691,075$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

## As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 249.310 | $2.27 \%$ | 395,880 | $2.10 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,195.140$ | $1.29 \%$ | $3,253,435$ | $1.24 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 17.380 | $0.10 \%$ | 13,075 | $0.11 \%$ |
| Waste | 141.940 | $0.96 \%$ | 28,385 | $0.92 \%$ |
| Other | 1.500 | $33.33 \%$ | 300 | $33.33 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $2,605.270$ | $1.23 \%$ | $3,691,075$ | $1.25 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |


| Grass: |
| :--- |
| 1G1 5.000 $0.89 \%$ 5,300 $1.61 \%$ $1,060.000$ <br> 1G 56.500 $10.08 \%$ 53,110 $16.10 \%$ 940.000 <br> 2G1 1.000 $0.18 \%$ 860 $0.26 \%$ 860.000 <br> $2 G$ 5.000 $0.89 \%$ 3,875 $1.17 \%$ 775.000 <br> 3G1 2.000 $0.36 \%$ 1,380 $0.42 \%$ 690.000 <br> $3 G$ 44.000 $7.85 \%$ 26,180 $7.94 \%$ 595.000 <br> $4 G 1$ 200.470 $35.75 \%$ 113,275 $34.34 \%$ 565.047 <br> 4G 246.760 $44.01 \%$ 125,845 $38.16 \%$ 509.989 <br> Grass Total 560.730 $100.00 \%$ 329,825 $100.00 \%$ 588.206 |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,325.410$ | $74.26 \%$ | $3,468,960$ | $90.15 \%$ | $1,491.762$ |
| Grass Total | 560.730 | $17.91 \%$ | 329,825 | $8.57 \%$ | 588.206 |
| Waste | 245.260 | $7.83 \%$ | 49,050 | $1.27 \%$ | 199.991 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,228.790$ |
| Market Area Total | $3,131.400$ | $100.00 \%$ | $3,847,835$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $2,325.410$ | $1.37 \%$ | $3,468,960$ | $1.33 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 560.730 | $3.38 \%$ | 329,825 | $2.76 \%$ |
| Waste | 245.260 | $1.67 \%$ | 49,050 | $1.59 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $3,131.400$ | $1.48 \%$ | $3,847,835$ | $1.30 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington
Market Area:
11

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 5.000 | 1.57\% | 10,750 | 2.54\% | 2,150.000 |
| 1D | 33.250 | 10.41\% | 70,325 | 16.58\% | 2,115.037 |
| 2D1 | 15.000 | 4.70\% | 29,775 | 7.02\% | 1,985.000 |
| 2D | 74.100 | 23.21\% | 117,820 | 27.79\% | 1,590.013 |
| 3D1 | 5.020 | 1.57\% | 6,625 | 1.56\% | 1,319.721 |
| 3D | 56.620 | 17.73\% | 73,325 | 17.29\% | 1,295.037 |
| 4D1 | 76.520 | 23.96\% | 76,140 | 17.96\% | 995.033 |
| 4D | 53.800 | 16.85\% | 39,275 | 9.26\% | 730.018 |
| Dry Total | 319.310 | 100.00\% | 424,035 | 100.00\% | 1,327.972 |

Grass:

| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1G | 11.700 | $17.60 \%$ | 11,000 | $25.30 \%$ | 940.170 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G | 13.780 | $20.73 \%$ | 10,680 | $24.57 \%$ | 775.036 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | 2.000 | $3.01 \%$ | 1,190 | $2.74 \%$ | 595.000 |
| 4G1 | 13.000 | $19.55 \%$ | 7,345 | $16.89 \%$ | 565.000 |
| 4G | 26.000 | $39.11 \%$ | 13,260 | $30.50 \%$ | 510.000 |
| Grass Total | 66.480 | $100.00 \%$ | 43,475 | $100.00 \%$ | 653.956 |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 319.310 | $70.99 \%$ | 424,035 | $88.28 \%$ | $1,327.972$ |
| Grass Total | 66.480 | $14.78 \%$ | 43,475 | $9.05 \%$ | 653.956 |
| Waste | 64.030 | $14.23 \%$ | 12,795 | $2.66 \%$ | 199.828 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,067.771$ |
| Market Area Total | 449.820 | $100.00 \%$ | 480,305 | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 319.310 | $0.19 \%$ | 424,035 | $0.16 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 66.480 | $0.40 \%$ | 43,475 | $0.36 \%$ |
| Waste | 64.030 | $0.43 \%$ | 12,795 | $0.42 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 449.820 | $0.21 \%$ | 480,305 | $0.16 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* |  | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 1A | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2 A 1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |


| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1D1 | $1,642.410$ | $22.82 \%$ | $3,531,130$ | $29.21 \%$ | $2,149.968$ |
| 1D | $1,973.050$ | $27.41 \%$ | $4,173,040$ | $34.53 \%$ | $2,115.019$ |
| 2D1 | 489.330 | $6.80 \%$ | 971,340 | $8.04 \%$ | $1,985.040$ |
| 2D | 24.000 | $0.33 \%$ | 38,160 | $0.32 \%$ | $1,590.000$ |
| 3D1 | 10.000 | $0.14 \%$ | 13,200 | $0.11 \%$ | $1,320.000$ |
| 3D | $1,599.100$ | $22.21 \%$ | $2,070,850$ | $17.13 \%$ | $1,295.009$ |
| 4D1 | 841.580 | $11.69 \%$ | 837,390 | $6.93 \%$ | 995.021 |
| 4D | 618.840 | $8.60 \%$ | 451,755 | $3.74 \%$ | 730.002 |
| Dry Total | $7,198.310$ | $100.00 \%$ | $12,086,865$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,679.125$ |


| Grass: |
| :--- |
| 1G1 72.100 $14.56 \%$ 76,425 $20.45 \%$ $1,059.986$ <br> 1 G 135.000 $27.26 \%$ 126,900 $33.96 \%$ 940.000 <br> 2G1 23.000 $4.64 \%$ 19,780 $5.29 \%$ 860.000 <br> $2 G$ 0.000 $0.00 \%$ 0 $0.00 \%$ 0.000 <br> 3G1 14.000 $2.83 \%$ 9,660 $2.59 \%$ 690.000 <br> $3 G$ 95.870 $19.36 \%$ 57,045 $15.27 \%$ 595.024 <br> $4 G 1$ 84.300 $17.02 \%$ 47,630 $12.75 \%$ 565.005 <br> $4 G$ 71.000 $14.34 \%$ 36,210 $9.69 \%$ 510.000 <br> Grass Total 495.270 $100.00 \%$ 373,650 $100.00 \%$ 754.436 |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $7,198.310$ | $88.48 \%$ | $12,086,865$ | $96.36 \%$ | $1,679.125$ |
| Grass Total | 495.270 | $6.09 \%$ | 373,650 | $2.98 \%$ | 754.436 |
| Waste | 442.130 | $5.43 \%$ | 82,805 | $0.66 \%$ | 187.286 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,541.760$ |
| Market Area Total | $8,135.710$ | $100.00 \%$ | $12,543,320$ | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $7,198.310$ | $4.24 \%$ | $12,086,865$ | $4.62 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 495.270 | $2.99 \%$ | 373,650 | $3.13 \%$ |
| Waste | 442.130 | $3.00 \%$ | 82,805 | $2.69 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $8,135.710$ | $3.83 \%$ | $12,543,320$ | $4.25 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres |  | Value |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| 1A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  | 0.000 |
| 1D1 | 5.000 | $50.00 \%$ | 10,750 | $57.49 \%$ |  |
| 1D | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | $2,150.000$ |
| 2D1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2D | 5.000 | $50.00 \%$ | 7,950 | $42.51 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3D1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | $1,590.000$ |
| 3D | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4D1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4D | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Dry Total | 10.000 | $100.00 \%$ | 18,700 | $100.00 \%$ | 0.000 |


| Grass: |  |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $2 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $4 G 1$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $4 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 10.000 | $6.85 \%$ | 18,700 | $46.63 \%$ | $1,870.000$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Waste | 136.000 | $93.15 \%$ | 21,400 | $53.37 \%$ | 157.352 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | 274.657 |
| Market Area Total | 146.000 | $100.00 \%$ | 40,100 | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 10.000 | $0.01 \%$ | 18,700 | $0.01 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Waste | 136.000 | $0.92 \%$ | 21,400 | $0.70 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 146.000 | $0.07 \%$ | 40,100 | $0.01 \%$ |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres |  | Value |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | Market Area: <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| 1A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4A1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4A | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  | 0.000 |
| 1D1 | 3.420 | $5.28 \%$ | 7,355 | $7.14 \%$ |  |
| 1D | 2.000 | $3.08 \%$ | 4,230 | $4.10 \%$ | $2,150.584$ |
| 2D1 | 19.750 | $30.46 \%$ | 39,205 | $38.04 \%$ | $2,115.000$ |
| 2D | 3.000 | $4.63 \%$ | 4,770 | $4.63 \%$ | $1,985.063$ |
| 3D1 | 34.710 | $53.54 \%$ | 45,820 | $44.46 \%$ | $1,590.000$ |
| 3D | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | $1,320.080$ |
| 4D1 | 0.950 | $1.47 \%$ | 945 | $0.92 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 4D | 1.000 | $1.54 \%$ | 730 | $0.71 \%$ | 994.736 |
| Dry Total | 64.830 | $100.00 \%$ | 103,055 | $100.00 \%$ | 730.000 |


| Grass: |  |  | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 2G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $2 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G1 | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| 3G | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $4 G 1$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| $4 G$ | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |


| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 64.830 | $90.81 \%$ | 103,055 | $98.74 \%$ | $1,589.619$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Waste | 6.560 | $9.19 \%$ | 1,310 | $1.26 \%$ | 199.695 |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  | $1,461.899$ |
| Market Area Total | 71.390 | $100.00 \%$ | 104,365 | $100.00 \%$ |  |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | 64.830 | $0.04 \%$ | 103,055 | $0.04 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Waste | 6.560 | $0.04 \%$ | 1,310 | $0.04 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 71.390 | $0.03 \%$ | 104,365 | $0.04 \%$ |

## County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: | Acres | \% of Acres* | Value | \% of Value* | Market Area: 26 <br> Average Assessed Value* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1A1 | 24.000 | 15.19\% | 58,205 | 24.03\% | 2,425.208 |
| 1A | 23.000 | 14.56\% | 54,400 | 22.46\% | 2,365.217 |
| 2A1 | 26.500 | 16.77\% | 51,545 | 21.28\% | 1,945.094 |
| 2A | 2.000 | 1.27\% | 3,400 | 1.40\% | 1,700.000 |
| 3A1 | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| 3A | 3.500 | 2.22\% | 4,165 | 1.72\% | 1,190.000 |
| 4A1 | 37.500 | 23.73\% | 35,250 | 14.55\% | 940.000 |
| 4A | 41.500 | 26.27\% | 35,275 | 14.56\% | 850.000 |
| Irrigated Total | 158.000 | 100.00\% | 242,240 | 100.00\% | 1,533.164 |
| Dry: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1D1 | 1,996.230 | 7.46\% | 4,291,920 | 11.17\% | 2,150.012 |
| 1D | 5,277.960 | 19.72\% | 11,162,985 | 29.05\% | 2,115.018 |
| 2D1 | 2,496.220 | 9.33\% | 4,955,100 | 12.89\% | 1,985.041 |
| 2D | 2,003.380 | 7.49\% | 3,185,385 | 8.29\% | 1,590.005 |
| 3D1 | 348.570 | 1.30\% | 410,425 | 1.07\% | 1,177.453 |
| 3D | 3,412.700 | 12.75\% | 4,419,520 | 11.50\% | 1,295.021 |
| 4D1 | 6,833.360 | 25.53\% | 6,799,330 | 17.69\% | 995.020 |
| 4D | 4,393.380 | 16.42\% | 3,207,220 | 8.35\% | 730.011 |
| Dry Total | 26,761.800 | 100.00\% | 38,431,885 | 100.00\% | 1,436.072 |
| Grass: |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1G1 | 159.500 | 4.03\% | 169,070 | 5.42\% | 1,060.000 |
| 1G | 560.520 | 14.16\% | 526,895 | 16.90\% | 940.011 |
| 2G1 | 75.220 | 1.90\% | 64,690 | 2.08\% | 860.010 |
| 2G | 189.900 | 4.80\% | 147,185 | 4.72\% | 775.065 |
| 3G1 | 52.000 | 1.31\% | 35,880 | 1.15\% | 690.000 |
| 3G | 341.020 | 8.61\% | 202,915 | 6.51\% | 595.023 |
| 4G1 | 975.590 | 24.64\% | 551,230 | 17.68\% | 565.022 |
| 4G | 1,606.110 | 40.56\% | 1,419,300 | 45.53\% | 883.687 |
| Grass Total | 3,959.860 | 100.00\% | 3,117,165 | 100.00\% | 787.190 |
| Irrigated Total | 158.000 | 0.46\% | 242,240 | 0.57\% | 1,533.164 |
| Dry Total | 26,761.800 | 78.63\% | 38,431,885 | 90.59\% | 1,436.072 |
| Grass Total | 3,959.860 | 11.63\% | 3,117,165 | 7.35\% | 787.190 |
| Waste | 3,155.340 | 9.27\% | 631,085 | 1.49\% | 200.005 |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% | 0.000 |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 34,035.000 | 100.00\% | 42,422,375 | 100.00\% | 1,246.433 |
| As Related to the County as a Whole |  |  |  |  |  |
| Irrigated Total | 158.000 | 1.44\% | 242,240 | 1.29\% |  |
| Dry Total | 26,761.800 | 15.75\% | 38,431,885 | 14.70\% |  |
| Grass Total | 3,959.860 | 23.88\% | 3,117,165 | 26.12\% |  |
| Waste | 3,155.340 | 21.43\% | 631,085 | 20.51\% |  |
| Other | 0.000 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0.00\% |  |
| Exempt | 0.000 | 0.00\% |  |  |  |
| Market Area Total | 34,035.000 | 16.04\% | 42,422,375 | 14.37\% |  |

2008 Agricultural Land Detail
County 89 - Washington

| Irrigated: |
| :--- |
| Acres |
| 1A1 |
| 1A |
| 2A1 |
| 2A |

As Related to the County as a Whole

| Irrigated Total | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dry Total | $1,535.890$ | $0.90 \%$ | $2,202,580$ | $0.84 \%$ |
| Grass Total | 484.660 | $2.92 \%$ | 298,690 | $2.50 \%$ |
| Waste | 207.530 | $1.41 \%$ | 41,505 | $1.35 \%$ |
| Other | 0.000 | $0.00 \%$ | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| Exempt | 640.000 | $97.80 \%$ |  |  |
| Market Area Total | $2,228.080$ | $1.05 \%$ | $2,542,775$ | $0.86 \%$ |

## 2008 Agricultural Land Detail

County 89 - Washington


| Total | $212,221.340$ | $295,258,435$ | $212,221.340$ | $100.00 \%$ | $295,258,435$ | $100.00 \%$ | $1,391.275$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

[^1]
## 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2007 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

|  | 2007 CTL <br> County Total | 2008 Form 45 County Total | Value Difference <br> (2007 Form 45-2006 CTL) | Percent Change | 2008 Growth <br> (New Construction Value) | \% Change excl. Growth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Residential | 846,513,860 | 875,801,148 | 29,287,288 | 3.46 | 14,681,245 | 1.73 |
| 2. Recreational | 1,250,810 | 1,281,595 | 30,785 | 2.46 | 33,355 | -0.21 |
| 3. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwellings | 231,877,810 | 237,035,175 | 5,157,365 | 2.22 | *---------- | 2.22 |
| 4. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) | 1,079,642,480 | 1,114,117,918 | 34,475,438 | 3.19 | 14,714,600 | 1.83 |
| 5. Commercial | 117,969,450 | 121,286,280 | 3,316,830 | 2.81 | 928,990 | 2.02 |
| 6. Industrial | 118,895,855 | 142,413,490 | 23,517,635 | 19.78 | 19,592,990 | 3.3 |
| 7. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings | 47,552,530 | 49,687,035 | 2,134,505 | 4.49 | 5,352,291 | -6.77 |
| 8. Minerals | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 9. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) | 284,417,835 | 313,386,805 | 28,968,970 | 10.19 | 20,521,980 | 2.97 |
| 10. Total Non-Agland Real Property | 1,364,060,315 | 1,427,507,588 | 63,447,273 | 4.65 | 40,588,871 | 1.68 |
| 11. Irrigated | 16,586,570 | 18,815,265 | 2,228,695 | 13.44 |  |  |
| 12. Dryland | 231,221,630 | 261,429,270 | 30,207,640 | 13.06 |  |  |
| 13. Grassland | 10,582,490 | 11,936,205 | 1,353,715 | 12.79 |  |  |
| 14. Wasteland | 2,346,600 | 3,076,795 | 730,195 | 31.12 |  |  |
| 15. Other Agland | 2,865 | 2,865 | -1,965 | -68.59 |  |  |
| 16. Total Agricultural Land | 260,740,155 | 295,258,435 | 34,518,280 | 13.24 |  |  |
| 17. Total Value of All Real Property | 1,624,800,470 | 1,722,766,023 | 97,965,553 | 6.03 | 40,588,871 | 3.53 |
| (Locally Assessed) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^2]
# 2007 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR <br> WASHINGTON COUTNY <br> ASSESSMENT YEARS 2008, 2009, AND 2010 <br> Date: June 13, 2007 

## PLAN OF ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the "plan"), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

## DISCLAMER:

This Plan of Assessment was developed to meet the requirements of Nebraska Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9. The reader should note that at the time this document is being prepared, the 2007 numbers are not available for State assessed personal property and State assessed real estate. In addition, homestead exemption applications are still being received, special valuation applications are being accepted and determinations on 775P exemptions are not finalized by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. Finally, the protest process is ongoing and the sales file is incomplete for 2008.

For the reasons stated above, it is difficult on June $15^{\text {th }}$, to describe and determine all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions.

Thank you to the reader for your time and understanding.

## REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value which is defined by law as "the marked value of real property in the ordinary course of trade." Nebraska Revised Statute 77-112 (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1) $100 \%$ of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land:
2) $75 \%$ of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3) $75 \%$ of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344.

Reference, Nebraska Revised Statute 77-201 (R. S. Supplement 2004).

## RECORD MAINTENANCE:

## MAPPING

Washington County's cadastral maps were completed in 1989. They are currently being maintained in the County Surveyor's Office for the Assessor's Office. All parcel splits, new subdivisions and ownership changes are kept up to date by the Assessor's Staff and Surveyor's Staff.

## OWNERSHIP

Real estate transfer statements are received from the County Clerk on an ongoing basis. Ownership transfers are made on the property record cards and in our CAMA system along with the sale information.

Assessor's Office has ownership of the cadastral maps.

## REPORT GENERATION

Nebraska State Statutes require the production of many reports. In Washington County, report generation is the responsibility of the Deputy Assessor with final approval of all data by the County Assessor. The following reports are required by statute and completed each year:

Abstract - Real Estate<br>Abstract - Personal Property<br>Certification of Values<br>School District Taxable Value Report<br>Certificate of Taxes Levied

From time to time, corrections to the tax list are required. If appropriate, the Assessor's Office presents the correction book to the County Board for approval. Once approved, the online computer correction is completed by the Assessor's Office, the property record card is updated and the information is forwarded to the Treasurer's Office via TerraScan. TerraScan is Washington County's CAMA system.

## ADMINISTER HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION:

The Assessment Specialist and the Assessor work with the administration of the homestead exemption worksheets, documentation, mailing of all forms, finding the median average of the county totals and updating of documents and computer records to reflect exemption values and taxes.

For the year of 2006 (payable in 2007) we had a total of 528 applicants and a value exempted of $\$ 43,632,180$ with a tax loss of $\$ 843,912$. The average median value for 2007 is not available at this time.

## ADMINISTER PERSONAL PROPERTY:

The Assessment Specialist works with the County Assessor in the administration of personal property. New business is obtained through following up on local and county building permits and discovery.

The County Assessor requested that all personal property filers provide us with their federal depreciation worksheet as part of the updating process.

The 2007 value of centrally assessed and the final determination of 775 P personal property is not available at this time.

The abstract totals for the year 2007 (payable in 2008) consisted of 691 commercial schedules with a value of $\$ 55,758,719$. The totals for agricultural schedules consisted of 481 with a value of $\$ 15,600,319$ and a combined total of $\$ 71,359,038$.

## ADMINISTER SPECIAL VALUATION:

The Assessor's Office administrates the filing of all special valuation applications for Washington County. This includes assisting the taxpayer in the completion of the application, verifying the information on the form and checking the zoning of the property for approval.

All corrections to the tax rolls for homestead exemption, personal property and special valuation are reviewed and approved by the County Assessor and the County Board in accordance with State rules and guidelines.

## GENERATE TAX ROLL:

The Assessor's Office also generates tax rolls for the real estate personal property, railroads and public services. Homestead exemption credits are also included on parcels approved for exemption on the tax rolls. The tax rolls are generated by the Assessor's office and the collection of the taxes are the responsibility of the County Treasurer.

## RESPONSIBILITIES OF APPRAISAL:

## VALUE ALL REAL PROPERTY

The Assessor with the assistance of the Residential Appraiser, Commercial Appraiser and the Deputy Assessor are the core team. This is the team that identifies the value of real property for Washington County.

## DEVELOP PLAN OF REVIEW

This core team also develops a yearly plan as to what needs to be reviewed, audited and updated for the upcoming year. In Washington County, the plan of review includes a physical inspection every three to five years. This will include a spot check of measurements for accuracy, re-assessment of quality and condition scores, and the addition or subtraction of any physical improvements.

In 2007, the land in all suburban urban and rural areas were reviewed and equalized.
In 2006, new Marshall and Swift costing tables were loaded on our CAMA system with appropriate adjustments to the depreciation schedules. In addition, unimproved rural sites were reviewed, improved procedures for developers discounts have been implemented, and adjustments to rural market areas that more accurately reflect the current market value.

## ESTABLISH PROCEDURE FOR PICKUP WORK

The requirement for pickup work is determined weekly. The Assessor's Office acquires building permits from planning and zoning, and the city and villages on an ongoing basis. The researching of building permits and market areas with current sales and discovery are used to identify potential pickup work. If the project is incomplete at the time of inspection, the property will be revisited on a date that is as close to December $31^{\text {st }}$ as possible. The project will be assigned a partial value for the amount of construction completed based off of the inspection completed closest to January ${ }^{\text {tt }}$ as possible. The value will be based off our own physical measurements, and not off the contractor's plans of specifications.

Pick up work is completed by the Commercial Appraiser, Residential Property Appraiser, and the Deputy Assessor with the approval of the County Assessor. A filing system by legal description is comprised of a property record card with a permanent picture, complete site and improvement information.

## REVIEW SALES

The Assessor's Office reviews all sales that occur in Washington County. Residential lot sales are reviewed by an Assessment Specialist. Residential improved and agriculture improved and unimproved sales are being completed by another Assessment Specialist. Commercial sales are reviewed by the Commercial Appraiser with final review being performed by the County Assessor and Deputy Assessor.

All sales are audited and reviewed by the Assessor. Updates to all values are performed on an annual basis. The Assessor with the assistance of the Residential Appraiser, Commercial Appraiser and the Deputy Assessor are the core team who value all real property for Washington County.

## PERSONNEL COUNT:

Position: Assessor/Deputy Assessor (2)
Position Description:
The Assessor administrates all the assessment duties as required by Nebraska State Statutes. He/she is responsible for completing many reports during the year within the statutory deadlines. The Assessor also works with the County Board of Supervisors as well as other elected officials. The Assessor also has to supervise the assessment and appraisal staff.

Continuing Education Requirements:
The Assessor/Deputy is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years. The Assessor/Deputy also attends other workshops and meetings to further his/her knowledge of the assessment field. The Assessor is currently a member of the Northeast Nebraska Assessor Association. The Deputy Assessor is a member of the Nebraska GIS conference and attends many workshops pertaining to GIS.

Position: Assessment Specialist (3)

## Position Description:

The Assessment Specialist has his/her areas of "expertise" in the various activities of the assessment field, such as personal property, homestead exemption, real estate transfers ( 521 's), and special valuations. All Assessment Specialists are able to assist in all areas of each activity, but every member has his or her own area for which they are responsible.

Continuing Education Requirements:

The Assessment Specialist position at this time does not have a continuing education requirement. The current position holders have voluntarily taken classes such as Residential Data Collection, Marshall \& Swift, TerraScan user education, as well as IAAO classes. Two of the current position holders have attained Assessor Certification. One position holder is currently a member of the Nebraska GIS conference and attends many workshops pertaining to GIS.

Position: $\quad$ Appraiser (2 plus 1part time)
Position Description:
Establish property value on an annual basis, coordinate the re-evaluation process, compile the necessary data needed to support value, track recent sales, supervise job tasks of appraisal assistants, and complete the appraisal assistant evaluation process.

Continuing Education Requirements:
The Appraiser position at this time does not have a continuing education requirement. Current position holders have voluntarily taken several classes in mass appraisal, geographical information systems TerraScan user education.

One is a licensed appraiser and the other two have attained Assessor Certification.

## BUDGETING:

The proposed budget was streamlined for 2005-2006. The major change is that the reappraisal and assessor budgets have been combined into one budget. It is our position that the new format allows for easier tracking of line items and reduces the effort required.

Budget Worksheet 2007-2008
605-00 County Assessor

| $1-0100$ | Official's Salary | $\$ 50,018.00$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1-0201$ | Deputy's Salary | $\$ 40,027.00$ |
| $1-0305$ | Regular Time Salaries | $\$ 140,841.00$ |
| $1-0405$ | Part Time Salaries | $\$ 41,916.00$ |
| $1-0505$ | Overtime | $\$ 88,138.00$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | Personnel Services Total | $\$ 280,940.00$ |


| $2-0100$ | Postal Services | $\$$ | $7,822.00$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $2-1701$ | Meals | $\$$ | 819.00 |
| $2-1702$ | Lodging | $\$$ | $2,186.00$ |
| $2-1704$ | Mileage Allowance | $\$$ | $2,733.00$ |
| $2-1801$ | Dues Subscriptions Registration | $\$$ | $1,095.00$ |
| $2-2000$ | Printing \& Publishing | $\$$ | $1,770.00$ |
| $2-3910$ | Assessor School | $\$$ | $3,279.00$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Operating Expenses Total | $\$$ | $19,704.00$ |


| $3-0100$ | Office Supplies | $\$$ | $6,638.00$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| $3-0128$ | Supplies - Data Processing | $\$$ | $2,186.00$ |
| $3-0211$ | Tires \& Car Expenses | $\$$ | $3,937.00$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Supplies and Materials Total | $\$$ | $12,761.00$ |
| $5-0315$ |  |  |  |
| $5-0500$ | Data Processing Equipment | $\$$ | $1,221.00$ |
| $5-1309$ | Office Equipment | $\$$ | 995.00 |
|  | Data Processing Software | $\$$ | 766.00 |
|  | Capital Outlay Total | $\$$ | $2,982.00$ |

## HISTORY:

Washington County is currently using TerraScan for all computer functions. The appraisal is being calculated by using the current Marshall \& Swift package and TerraScan.

## WHAT HAS BEEN DONE IN CAMA

All residential, commercial, agricultural and personal property are entered into TerraScan, our current CAMA computer system. Washington County has the ability to digitize photo's in this system with a digital camera.

## PROCESS TO THIS POINT

With TerraScan, Washington County has the capability of electronic pricing, generating reports, calculating personal property depreciation and performing many general tasks of the County Assessor's Office.

At this time, Washington County is entering pictures and sketches into their CAMA system. Washington County's CAMA or TerraScan is located in Lincoln, Nebraska.

Sales are loaded in the system. They are also recorded in a hard copy sales book along with pictures and the current history of the property. The 521's are kept in binders and archived for future reference. All documents are in good condition and order in accordance with the book and page number.

## PICTURES AND SKETCHES

Pictures and sketches are kept in the parcel record card at this time.

## COMPARABLE SELECTION NEEDS WORK

Washington County has a hard copy sales book that includes pictures and sales sheet for all recent sales that have taken place in the county.

The county has an ongoing plan to keep the parcels updated to current through a review process of sales, building permits, discovery and drive by reviews.

## RE-LISTED TOWNS

Old records are presumed to be accurate and complete.

## WHAT WE NEED TO COMPLETE

June of 2005 Marshall and Swift costing tables are currently loaded on the CAMA system with appropriate adjustments to the depreciation schedules. For 2008, additional adjustments will be made as required.

## TOTAL RE-LISTING AND DATA ENTRY

The parcel cards are reviewed and edited on a yearly basis with any corrections being made to the card.
The three year plan is reviewed on a yearly basis with the overall decisions based on current budget constraints.

The Assessor's Office, with the help of their consultant and the County Surveyor's Office, has developed a parcel grid for the new Geographic Information System that mirrors the hard copy cadastral maps. In addition the parcel identifier numbers have been loaded. Other information is being developed for future GIS implementation.

## PARCEL COUNT:

The following numbers are based off the 2007 abstract. Please be aware that additional changes have occurred since the abstract. These numbers do not include centrally assessed and the final determinations for 775P by the department of Property Assessment and Taxation.

List the number of residential parcels and value. The number of parcels is 7,515 with a value of $\$ 850,202,650$.
List the number of commercial parcels and value. The number of parcels is 665 with a value of $\$ 119,126,935$.
List the number of industrial parcels and value. The number of parcels is 44 with a value of $\$ 118,895,855$.

List the number of agricultural parcels and value. The total number of agricultural parcels is 4,011 including agriculture land value, agricultural (home \& building) sites and improvements $\$ 538,642,805$. The total number of home site unimproved rural land, home site improved rural land, and home site improvements - is 1413 with a value of $\$ 231,068,680$.

The total number of parcels with greenbelt special value is 3,946 . The greenbelt value is $\$ 258,870,045$ with a recapture value of $\$ 509,965,090$.

The number of recreational parcels is 53 with a value of $\$ 1,250,810$.

List the number of personal property parcels and value for 2007. Personal property parcel total for commercial is 691 with a total value of $\$ 55,758,719$. The parcel total for agriculture is 481 with a total value of $\$ 15,600,319$.

List the number of homestead exemption applications and value. The information for the year of 2007 is not available at this time. Total number of exempt parcels for 2006 (payable in 2007) was 528 and a value exempted of $\$ 43,632,180$ with a tax loss of 843,912 .

## CADASTRAL MAPS:

Washington County's cadastral maps are in hard copy form. The rural areas have aerial photos, flown in 1988, along with mylars of the soil surveys. The urban and suburban areas only have area and ownership lines. A Geographic Information System is currently being implemented in Washington County.

## MAINTAINED BY ASSESSMENT

Washington County's cadastral maps are maintained by the County Surveyor's Office.
IN GOOD CONDITION

The cadastral maps are updated as required and are in good condition.

## PROPERTY RECORD CARD:

The property record cards are a combination of hard copy, including a picture, along with a computer generated cost estimate and value summary sheet.

## MAINTAINED BY ASSESSMENT

The property record cards are updated as needed. When a property is reviewed a new picture is taken, and a walk around or drive by inspection is completed. The information is then updated on the property record card and the CAMA system.

## IN GOOD CONDITION

The property record cards are updated on a regular basis and are in good condition. All property record cards were updated with sales, transfers and building permit information. Computer data entry was completed at the same time.

## REAL ESTATE TRANSFERS (521's):

## WHAT ARE THEY

The 521's are in hard copy form with an attachment containing the document filed with the County Clerk's Office. The 521's document the legal description, the successor or "grantor" and the purchaser or the grantee's name and address. In addition, the sale price, and type of sale are listed.

## MAINTAINED BY ASSESSMENT

The 521's are in binders in the Assessor's Office for archival purposes.

## IN GOOD CONDITION

The 521 's are in hard copy form, bound by deed book and page number. They are kept in current status for referral use and archived in the vault for future reference.

## PROCEDURE MANUAL:

The Assessor's Office is documenting individual procedures for inclusion in a procedural manual.

Three members of the staff studied for assessor certification, tested and became State certified. With continuing education classes, job sharing and workshop participation, the Assessor's Office has become more diversified in areas of expertise.

## GENERALLY DESCRIBE EACH PROCESS IN THE OFFICE

Office functions have been previously addressed in this document. Each area has been instructed in specific office functions. Specific functions with help notes are available from TerraScan. In addition, compliance with Nebraska State Statutes and Regulations is a priority. Changes in the office have increased the areas of expertise within the Assessor's Office.

## LEAVES ROOM FOR INDIVIDUAL APPROACHES

The Assessor's Office is sharing in ideas, work flow analysis and planning. This has allowed the office to implement additional training functions for each employee, to streamline the office, and to increase workflow.

## BASED ON REGULATIONS AND IAAO GUIDELINES

The Assessor establishes the guidelines for this assessment function. The Assessor and the Appraisal Team are working closely on function guidelines and the processing of the values. Also, the Appraiser establishes guidelines for appraisal functions. The Staff Appraiser is assessor certified currently training another Assessment Specialist to assist with outside reviews and updating of hard copy cards. Both work closely with the Assessor in this process. The Staff Appraiser reviews existing farm sites, rural subdivisions and residential properties. Properties lying within the review area are also visually reviewed and updates are made to the property record card for any recent improvements or depreciable items noted.

The Deputy Assessor working closely with the commercial appraiser on appraisal techniques, software programs and reviewing lots, rural home sites and rural subdivisions.

## ASSESSMENT FUNCTIONS:

## SPECIFIC DUTIES ASSIGNED TO INDIVIDUALS

## Assessor

Deputy Assessor Assist county assessor
Commercial Appraiser Responsible to report to county assessor concerning commercial

Residential Appraisers (2) Responsible to report to county assessor concerning residential

Assessment Specialist \#1
Assessment Specialist \#2
prop. prop. Personal property, homestead and permissive exemptions.

Residential lot sales, 521 's and misc. Duties as needed.

Agricultural, residential improvements \& commercial sales 521 's and green belt applications.

Procedures are established by the Assessor, State Statutes, and Regulations.

## APPRAISAL FUNCTIONS:

## SPECIFIC DUTIES ASSIGNED TO INDIVIDUALS

The Appraiser reviews residential improvements. The value for assessment purposes is determined by the Residential Appraiser with assistance from the Assessor.

Agricultural improvements, both old and new are reviewed by the residential appraiser. The assessed values are determined by the Residential Appraiser with assistance from the Assessor.

Residential urban, suburban, and rural sites are reviewed and assessed values are determined by the Assessor and the Residential Appraiser.

Commercial land and improvements, both old and new are reviewed by the Commercial Appraiser. The assessed values are determined by the Commercial Appraiser.

Industrial land and improvements, both old and new are reviewed by the Commercial Appraiser. The assessed values are determined by the Commercial Appraiser.

Procedures are established by State Regulations and appraiser field work monitored by the Appraiser. All residential field work is completed and monitored by the Residential Appraiser. Due to job sharing one of the Assessment Specialists is assisting the Residential Appraiser.

All commercial field work is completed and monitored by the Commercial Appraiser.
All industrial field work is completed and monitored by the Commercial Appraiser.
All agricultural improvement field work is completed and monitored by the Residential Appraiser. Due to job sharing, one of the Assessment Specialists is assisting the Residential Appraiser. All agricultural unimproved field work is completed by the Assessor and staff.

## SALES ANALYZED BY THE APPRAISER

All 521's are reviewed for completion and accuracy
Residential sales are reviewed by the appraiser. This review includes a drive-by inspection along with a new picture.

Commercial and industrial sales are reviewed by the Commercial Appraiser.
A drive by review, card update and new picture of property are part of this review.

## ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS TO CLASSES AND SUBCLASSES

Annual adjustments to classes and subclasses are based on statistical analysis of sales by market area or subclass. Annual adjustments are accomplished with the assistance of statistical information that is provided by the State and sales information. These adjustments are applied by area.

## CLASS OR SUBCLASS

Every three to five years the new updated Marshall \& Swift cost estimates are loaded on our CAMA system with new depreciation numbers being established for the individual properties. The most recent update was in June of 2006.

Land values are adjusted, based on sales of similar properties, to reflect market values. Land values are increasing at a very fast rate and have to be reviewed and may need to be adjusted on a yearly bases.

## PROPERTY REVIEW:

Detailed review of all property is scheduled every three to five years

## RE-MEASURE RESIDENTIAL

Residential properties are normally inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if any contrary information appears, the properties are reviewed and re-measured.

COMMERCIAL
Commercial properties are normally inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if any contrary information appears, the properties are reviewed and re-measured.

## INDUSTRIAL

Industrial properties are inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if contrary information appears, the properties are reviewed and re-measured.

## AGRICULTURAL

Agricultural properties are inspected every three to five years, if any changes are noted or if any contrary information appears, the properties are reviewed and re-measured.

## INTERIOR AND EXTERIOR INSPECTION

Interior inspections are done on all new construction and for all property protests prior to meeting with the County Board of Equalization. Exterior inspections are done with each sale and during any pickup work on a related property located within the same area.

## RESIDENTIAL

Residential properties/exteriors are inspected on an ongoing basis. If any changes are noted or if the Assessor's information appears suspect the properties are reviewed and re-measured. Interior inspections are more difficult in Washington County since the majority of homeowners are working. Interior inspections are usually required by the County Board of Equalization as part of the protest process prior to any decision being formed by the Board.

COMMERCIAL

Commercial properties are inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if contrary information appears, the properties are inspected on the exterior and interior.

INDUSTRIAL

Industrial properties are inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if contrary information appears, the properties are inspected on the exterior and interior.

## AGRICULTURAL

Agricultural properties are inspected every three to five years. If any changes are noted or if any contrary information appears, the properties are inspected on the exterior.

## DEPRECIATION ANALYSIS BASED ON RCN AND SALES:

RESIDENTIAL

All residential sales are entered into TerraScan, Washington County's CAMA data base system. The system generates a printout that indicates a current RCN along with a sales price per sq. ft. The depreciation indicated by the sales is applied back to similar properties.

COMMERCIAL

All commercial sales are entered into a data base that generates a report that indicates overall depreciation based on current RCN, along with a sale price per sq. ft . The depreciation indicated by the sales is applied back to similar properties.

INDUSTRIAL

There are very few sales of industrial property. The depreciation used for industrial property in Washington County is usually observed condition along with age and life.

## AGRICULTURAL

All agricultural sales are entered into TerraScan. The system generates a report that indicates a current RCN along with a sales price per sq. ft . The depreciation indicated by the sales is applied back to similar properties.

## SALES REVIEW:

## DONE ON MONTHLY BASIS

The sale review is conducted by the Assessment Specialist. The County Assessor ensures the review of 521's.

## INTERVIEW BUYER WHERE POSSIBLE

All sellers receive a form pertaining to the sale. This form is to be filled out and mailed back to the Assessor. The County has found that this is the most efficient way to complete the process. A sketch is then added to the electronic file. All pictures and sketches are retained on hard copy.

The sales book is maintained by the Assessment Specialists with counter copies available to the public.

## DISCUSSION OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY:

## HOW MUCH IS COMPLETE IN THE CAMA SYSTEM

All parcels in Washington County are in the TerraScan system. At this time the Assessor's Office in the process of loading pictures and sketches in the CAMA system.

Hard copy files contain a picture and sketch of each parcel. It is estimated that it will be 3 to 5 years before all the pictures and sketches will be loaded into the computer database.

## ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION

2008

Initiate a six-year plan to perform a physical review and re-listing of all residential properties in Washington County. Blair will be the most likely choice for 2008 re-listing. Residential properties that are not re-valued should be adjusted by percentage, if required, to reflect appreciation of value.

The fourth year of a five-year plan to load all sketches on-line.

2009

Continue with a six-year plan to perform a physical review and re-listing of all residential properties in Washington County. Arlington and Ft. Calhoun will be the most likely choice for 2009. Residential properties that are not re-valued should be adjusted by percentage, if required, to reflect appreciation of value.

The fifth and final year of a five-year plan to load all sketches on-line.
2010

Continue with a six-year plan to perform a physical review and re-listing of all residential properties in Washington County. Residential properties that are not re-valued should be adjusted by percentage, if required, to reflect appreciation of value.

## DISCUSSION OF COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY:

HOW MUCH IS COMPLETED IN THE CAMA SYSTEM

All commercial property information is stored in the Marshall \& Swift cost estimator. This is an appraisal data base that includes the land size along with the property characteristics.

## ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION

The county has initiated a 3 to 5 year cycle of re-valuing the commercial and industrial property in Washington County. The re-valuing was initiated in the small towns. The Commercial Appraiser reviews sales files to determine which subclasses require attention.

## DISCUSSION OF AGRICULTURAL PROPERTY:

HOW MUCH IS COMPLETED IN THE CAMA SYSTEM
All land parcels including improvements are located in the TerraScan system. The photo's, sketches and cadastral mapping are not located on TerraScan, however, they are located on hard copy for archival purposes.

## LAND

All agricultural land in Washington County is valued four times. A market value is established based off of best use. A recapture value is established based on $100 \%$ of market value. A special use value is established based on uninfluenced agriculture use. Finally, an assessed value is established based on $75 \%$ of the special use value.

The Assessor reviews these values, as required.
IMPROVEMETS
All agricultural improvements in Washington County are valued with the Marshall \& Swift cost manual. The acre of ground under the house was re-valued in 2006 for all of the rural areas.

## ESTIMATED DATE OF COMPLETION

The houses and out buildings are scheduled for re-valuation over a four-year period.

## CONCLUSION:

## DISCUSS PROPOSED END RESULT

Washington County has a good system to document growth, building permits, new buildings and commercial property sales. A system is in place for tracking personal property and new business in the county. Any furthering of a GIS system, total re-listing or additional education will need to be approved through the county board due to budgeting.

## ADVANTAGES OF GOOD RECORDS

Good records maintain our information in an archival condition that exemplifies the respect and integrity of the data for the Assessor's Office, Washington County and State.

## ANNUAL RE-VALUE

The decision of the annual re-value is done by the Assessor and the Appraisal Team.

## LESS STICKER SHOCK

Washington County will always have sticker shock in varying degrees as due to the appreciated values of ag land, residential property and home sites. This sticker shock is not only in Washington County but also surrounding counties.

Nebraska Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation<br>Attn: Jerome P. Tooker - Field Liasion<br>1033 "O" Street<br>Suite 600<br>Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Re: The Washington County 2007 Plan of Assessment

Dear Mr. Tooker,
Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the "plan"), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

As you are aware, the timing of the plan of assessment and the number of years changed.
Please contact me if you have questions or if more is required.
Sincerely,

Steven Mencke
Washington County Assessor
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, Nebraska 68008
(402)426-6800

# Washington County Board of Equalization 

Attn: Harlo Wilcox - Chairman
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, Nebraska 68008

Re: The Washington County 2007 Plan of Assessment

Dear Mr. Wilcox and the Board of Equalization,
Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the "plan"), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

Please contact me if you have questions or if more is required.
Sincerely,

Steven Mencke
Washington County Assessor
1555 Colfax Street
Blair, Nebraska 68008
(402)426-6800

## 2008 Assessment Survey for Washington County

## I. General Information

## A. Staffing and Funding Information

| 1. | Deputy(ies) on staff |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 1 |
| 2. | Appraiser(s) on staff |
| 3. | Other full-time employees |
|  | 2 |
| 4. | Other part-time employees |
|  | 2 One part-time employee is a certified general appraiser |
| 5. | Number of shared employees |
|  | 0 |
| 6. | Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year |
|  | 306,276 |
| 7. | Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system |
|  | Computer fund and GIS fund is a shared budget between several county offices. <br> And not a budget item in the assessors budget. <br> 8. |
|  | Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above |
|  | 306,276 |
| 9. | Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work |
|  | The appraisal funds are included in the assessors overall budget. |
| 10. | Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops |
|  | 3,279 |
| 11. | Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget |
|  | These funds are maintained as part of the total budget. |
|  |  |


| 12. | Other miscellaneous funds |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | These funds are also maintained as part of the total budget. |
| 13. | Total budget |
|  | 306,276 |
| a. | Was any of last year's budget not used: |
|  | 0 A minimal amount |

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

| 1. | Administrative software |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Terra Scan |
| 2. | CAMA software |
|  | Terra Scan |
| 3. | Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used? |
| 4. | Yes Cadastral maps were printed in 1989 |
|  | Assessor's office staff and this paper cadastral map is the official record for the <br> county. Updates are maintained between the assessors and the surveyor's offices in <br> a cooperative manner. |
| 5. | Does the county have GIS software? |
|  | Yes <br> 6.Who maintains the GIS software and maps?Assessor's office staff also there is cooperation with the surveyor's office. Applied <br> Data is the GIS Vender. <br> 7.Personal Property software:Terra Scan |

## C. Zoning Information

| 1. | Does the county have zoning? |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | Yes |
|  | Yes |
| 3. | What municipalities in the zoning countywide? |
|  | Arlington, Blair *, Fort Calhoun, Herman, Kennard Washington |
| 4. | When was zoning implemented? |
|  | 1970 but there have been updates to the original plan. An updated comprehensive <br> plan was implemented in June of 2005. |

## D. Contracted Services

| 1. | Appraisal Services |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Bill Kaiser is a contract appraiser for the commercial and industrial class of <br> properties. |
| 2. | Other services |
|  | Terra Scan is contracted for support for the administrative and appraisal software <br> maintenance. Applied Data Consultants has been contracted for help with the GIS <br> programming and maintenance. |

## Certification

This is to certify that the 2008 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:
-Five copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

- One copy to the Wasington County Assessor, by certified mail, return receipt requested, 70062760000063875180.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2008.


[^0]:    NOTES:

[^1]:    * Department of Property Assessment \& Taxation Calculates

[^2]:     outbuildings is shown in line 7.

